

699.B.20 2
A 2
SCRIPTURAL ESSAY

TOWARDS THE PROOF
OF AN
IMMORTAL SPIRIT IN MAN;
BEING A
CONTINUATION
OF THE
REMARKS
ON

Dr. Priestley's System of Materialism,
Just Published.

BY JOSEPH BENSON.

Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures. Ye suppose a doctrine is not in them, because ye have not found it in them. Because ye have shut your own eyes ye vainly imagine there is no light in the Sun, and take upon you to affirm it. Not knowing the power of God, you call that impossible which you cannot do, deem that absurd which you do not comprehend, and pronounce that false which you wish to be so.

Hen. Hunter, D. D.

H U L L:

PRINTED BY GEORGE PRINCE, IN SCALE-LANE, AND
SOLD AT THE NEW CHAPEL, CITY ROAD, LONDON
AND AT THE REVEREND MR. WESLEY'S
PREACHING HOUSES IN TOWN
AND COUNTRY.

SCRIPTURAL ESSAY

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

P R E F A C E.

TH E substance of the following little tract was delivered in a sermon preached at Hull, from Eccles. xii. 7. The Author had preached the preceding evening from the first verse of the Chapter, on the occasion of the death of a young person who was suddenly snatched away in the flower of youth, at a time when she was attending the dying bed, and daily expecting the dissolution of a tender mother. Though it pleased the Lord she should be unexpectedly taken hence before her mother, yet her mother soon followed, and overtook her daughter in those bright regions where death and parting are no more. Having exhorted a large congregation of both sexes to improve the death of the young woman and to "remember their Creator in the days of their youth," it was judged proper to comfort the relations and friends of the deceased, by shewing them, from the holy Scriptures, those infallible records of truth, that her better part was not dead but alive, and should live for ever-more. What was then delivered extempore, the Author afterwards more maturely considered, and put down in writing, with considerable enlargement. He hopes,

A 2

though

though most of the passages of Scripture, quoted in the following sheets, as proofs of a separate state, are produced and argued from in an Essay of Dr. *Watts* on the same subject; yet that whoever has carefully read that Essay, will not think it labour lost, to read this tract also, the subject being here treated in a different method; the Scriptures arranged in a different order, and in general (he trusts) set in as clear and convincing a point of view. And as for those who have never seen that book of Dr. *Watts*, he doubts not but this treatise, though small, will be doubly welcome to such, the subject being, undoubtedly, of deep importance to every child of man, and a subject upon which every further degree of light must seem very desirable to every thinking mind. At a time therefore when opinions so degrading to our *rational* and *immortal nature* are so sedulously propagated, and no pains spared to rob the human race of so considerable and important a part of their existence, as that which intervenes between death and the resurrection, it seems a duty which he owes both to God and his fellow-creatures, to offer this little piece to the public: And, he doubts not but it will meet with the same indulgence which some other of his late publications have met with. He earnestly recommends the arguments advanced in it, to the serious consideration of the reader, and begs that God may give to his *own truth* his *own blessing*.

A
SCRIPTURAL ESSAY
TOWARDS THE PROOF
OF AN
IMMORTAL SPIRIT IN MAN.

S E C T I O N I.

THE present life is, at the longest, so short, and in every state so uncertain, that it surely must appear of the greatest importance to every considerate man to know (if such a thing can be known) what becomes of us when we die; whether we then cease to exist, as *conscious thinking beings*, at least till the resurrection, or whether we enter *immediately* upon another life, a life in which we are *happy* or *miserable* according to our conduct in the present world. This latter has certainly been the opinion of the greatest part of mankind, in all ages, and has been the great guard of virtue in all nations under heaven, especially where the doctrines of a general Resurrection and future Judgment have not been made known. It is true, in *beathen* nations, even the most civilized, the subject has been clogged, obscured, and rendered almost ridiculous by many strange and absurd notions respecting the manner of our existence, and the

nature of our employments, pains or pleasures, in that other and future life. But no argument can be drawn from hence against the universal prevalence of this opinion but what would be equally conclusive against the belief of a Deity being deemed universal: for this has also been clogged, obscured and rendered almost ridiculous, by many extravagant and senseless tales concerning the number of Beings to be accounted *Gods*, their *origin*, *natures*, *employments* and *pleasures*.

2. It is hard to say *positively* how the opinion I speak of, came to be so universally received among men; but it seems most likely to have been derived by *tradition*, from the first parents of mankind and handed down from age to age. Unless we rather say that the great Author of our Being has implanted a notion of a future life to commence *immediately* upon the death of the body, in every human creature, and made an idea of a state of rewards and punishments to succeed our time of trial here, congenial with our very frame.

3. Be this as it will, according to the most authentic accounts we have of mankind, this opinion, (or *faith* I should rather call it) was entertained in the earliest ages of the world, and another and better life was the hope and expectation of the Patriarchs of old amidst the tranquility and comfort which attended their simple and plain way of living. Even *they*, though their lives were protracted to near a thousand years, *confessed that they were but pilgrims and strangers upon the earth, and sought another country, that is an heavenly*. Hence God was not ashamed to be called their God, having prepared for them a city. See Heb. xi. 10, 13, 16. The case was exactly the same after the *Mosaic Institution* took place. Though the Israelites, as a nation, were encouraged to obedience by promises of temporal happiness in Canaan, and in case of disobedience were

were threatened with temporal misery, in various forms: yet still both the righteous and the wicked among them, as *individuals*, looked beyond the grave for the chief recompence of their works, and that at a time when, it seems, few among them knew any thing of the resurrection of the body and a *set, solemn and final* judgment.—Accordingly we find in the records of those ages, I mean the ages preceding the birth of Christ, manifest traces of this. Those which occur in the inspired writings shall be produced in the course of this Essay, at present I shall only refer to that remarkable passage found in the third Chapter of the book of *Wisdom*, which, though not of equal authority with the canonical books, is yet sufficiently authentic to prove that the sentiments of the Jews on this head were what I here represent them to have been. *The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, and their departure is taken for misery and their going from us to be utter destruction; but they are in peace; for though they be perished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality. And Ch. iv. 7. Though the righteous be prevented by death, yet shall they be in rest.*

4. That the same doctrine was received among other nations we have sufficient proof—Grotius (*De Verit. Chris. Rel.*) speaks of it as * *A most ancient tradition which, handed down from the first Parents of mankind, hath been spread among all the more civilized nations, as appears from Homer's Poems, and from the Philosophers, not of the Greeks only, but also*

* “*Antiquissima traditio, quæ a primis (unde enim alioqui?) parentibus ad populos moratiores pene omnes manavit, ut ex Homeri carminibus apparet, et ex Philosophis, non Græcorum tantum, sed et Gallorum veterum, quos Druidas vocabant et Indorum quos Brachmanes: et ex iis quæ de Ægyptiis et Thracibus quin et Germanis, Scriptores plurimi prodiderunt.*”

also of the ancient Gauls, whom they called Druids, and of the Indians whom they termed Brackmans; and from the accounts which many writers have given of the Egyptians, Thracians, nay and Germans. And in the Notes, which he has added to that excellent work, he produces many indubitable testimonies of the truth of these things, and observes further, § *When the Canary Islands, America, and other remote parts of the world were first discovered, the same opinion concerning the immortality of the soul and a future state was found to prevail there.*

5. To the same purpose “Zanchius (de immortalitate animæ) hath produced many important testimonies from the ancient Chaldeans, Grecians, Pythagoreans, Stoics, Platonists and others which evidently shew they made no doubt of this matter. Phocylides says † *The soul is immortal and never grows old, but lives for ever.* Trismegistus, the celebrated Philosopher, says † *Man consists of two parts, being mortal in respect of his body, but immortal in respect of his soul, which is the true substantial man.* Plato, it is well known, disputes largely for it, and observes, among other things, *If it were not so, wicked men would certainly have the advantage of the righteous, as after they had committed all manner of evil they would suffer none.* The Turks, in the Coran acknowledge it, and speak largely of the pains and pleasures of departed souls. And the very savage and illiterate Indians so firmly believe it, that wives chearfully cast themselves into the flames to attend the souls of their husbands, and subjects to attend the souls of

§ “Etiam cum in Canarias, Americam et alia longinqua loca primum ventum est, reperta ibi quoque eadem de animis et iudicio sententia.”

† Ψυχη δε αθανατος και αγηρος ζη δια παντος.

† ανθρωπος διπλους, δια το σωμα θνητος, αθανατος δε δια Ψυχην, τον ουσιωδη ανθρωπον.

of their kings in the other world." (Vid. Flavel on the soul.)

6. It is true, there might be individuals in all nations who disbelieved this doctrine, and among the Jews, though favoured with the Oracles of God, a little before the time of Christ there arose a sect, I mean the sect of the *Sadduces*, who were entire infidels as to this point, and indeed as to the *spiritual* world in general. For they held that there was neither angel nor spirit, nor any future life at all. And there are not wanting modern Sadduces; even since life and immortality have been brought to light by the Gospel. And though those who believe the Scriptures cannot, for shame, deny a future state altogether, yet many who call themselves Christians deny it in part. The *Socinians*, with Dr. *Priestley* at their head, deny the *separate existence of the soul* after death, or, which comes to much the same thing, assert that it sleeps. And on the other hand the *Deists* deny the *resurrection of the body*, so that between both we lose all and sink down to a level with brute beasts.

7. Among those who deny the immortality of the soul, some with Dr. *Priestley* suppose that it is no way *distinct* from the body, but is the *result* of corporeal organization, and of consequence that it dies with the body. Others, with the late Bishop of Carlisle, suppose that though it *is* in a sense *distinct* from the body and has a separate existence when the body dies; yet, that it passes the whole interval between death and Judgment in a kind of *sleep* or *stupor* so as to be utterly insensible and unactive.

In opposition to these opinions I shall endeavour to shew.

First, That the soul is *distinct* from the body and shall exist in a *separate state*.

Secondly, That it shall not *sleep*, or be in a state of
stupor

super or *inactivity*, but in a state of conscious happiness or misery.

Thirdly, That the souls of the faithful are with *Jesus*.

SECTION II.

IN proof of my *first proposition*, viz. that *the soul is of a nature distinct from the body, and shall out-live it and exist in a separate state*, I might mention the opinion of the greatest part of mankind, especially of the wise and good, respecting this matter, as stated in the former *Section*. This has been considered by many great and learned men as a very weighty argument. In this light it is represented and insisted much upon by the two learned Authors above-mentioned, Grotius and Zanchius. The latter observes * *In every thing the consent of all nations is to be accounted a law of nature and therefore, with all good men, it should be instead of a thousand demonstrations, and to resist it (as he adds) what is it, but to resist the voice of God?* Seneca considered the matter in the same light. § *We are wont to attribute much to the opinion of all men. When we discourse concerning the immortality of the soul, the consent of mankind, either fearing the other world or desiring it, has no little weight with us.*

2. The

* “ *In omni re consensus omnium gentium lex naturæ putanda est: eoque instar mille demonstrationum talis consensus apud bonos esse debet.*”

§ “ *Multum dare solemus (says he Epist. 17.) presumptioni omnium hominum: Cum de animæ æternitate differimus, non leve momentum apud nos habet consensus hominum, aut timor-ium inferos, aut colentium.*

2. The consent of all nations has ever been considered as a conclusive argument in favour of the *being of a God*, and why should it not be considered as an argument equally conclusive in favour of the *immortality of the soul*? Surely what Grotius says of the *former* of those great principles of all religion and virtue, may with equal propriety be applied to the latter. * “ One argument whereby we prove the soul to be immortal is taken from the most manifest consent of all nations among whom reason and religion have not been wholly extinguished by prevailing barbarity. For since the things which proceed from the will of man are not the same among all and are often changed; but this opinion is every where to be found and remains unchanged amidst the vicissitudes of times; it is altogether necessary that some cause be assigned for it which may extend to the whole human race; which can be no other than either a revelation from God himself, or a tradition derived from the first parents of mankind; of which if we admit the first, the matter in question is determined, and if the latter, no sufficient reason, surely, can be assigned, why we should suppose the first Parents of mankind handed down any thing false to all their Posterity, in an affair of the greatest moment.”

3. But

* “ Argumentum, quo probamus numen esse aliquod, sumitur a manifestissimo consensu omnium gentium, apud quas ratio et boni mores non plane extincta sunt inducta feritate. Nam cum quæ ex hominum arbitratu veniunt, nec eadem sint apud omnes, et sepe mutantur; hæc autem notio nusquam non repenitur, neque temporum vicissitudine mutetur: — omnino causam ejus aliquam dari convenit, quæ se ad omne genus humanum extendat: quæ alia esse non potest, quam aut oraculum Dei ipsius, aut traditio quæ a primis humani generis parentibus manarit; quorum prius si admittimus, constat de quo quæritur: sin posterius, nulla sane ratio assignari poterit idonea cur primos illos parentes credamus falsum aliquid in re momenti maximi ad omnes posteros prodidisse.”

3. But as the sacred *Scriptures* alone, and especially the *New Testament* can fully determine the point, I shall chiefly refer the matter to their decision. Before I do this, I would only just mention an argument or two founded on reason and nature, which however I think perfectly conclusive. If the *soul* has no manner of existence or consciousness separate from the body; if it be merely the result of some certain arrangement or composition or motion of the fluids or solids in the animal body, and which of course is destroyed, when that particular arrangement, composition or motion is destroyed; or if it be something else superadded to the body by our Creator, which however will not outlive it, but cease to exist and lose its very being when the body dies; "then (as Dr. *Watts* justly observes) this conscious and thinking principle having lost its existence for a season, will be quite a new thing or another creature at the Resurrection. The man will be properly another *person*, another *self*, another *I* or *he*. And such a new conscious principle or person cannot properly be rewarded or punished for personal virtues or vices which were transacted in this mortal state by another distinct principle of Consciousness and of which therefore itself cannot be conscious by any power of *memory* or *reflection*," (unless laid under a delusion by the omnipotence of God.) "For if the conscious principle itself or the thinking being has ceased to exist, it is impossible it should, upon true grounds, have any consciousness or memory of former actions, since itself began to be but in the moment of the resurrection. The doctrine of rewarding or punishing the *same soul* or intelligent nature which did good or evil in this life, necessarily requires that the *same soul*, or intelligent nature, should have a continued or uninterrupted existence, that so the same conscious

scious being which did good or evil may be rewarded or punished."

4. The following extracts from Dr. S. Clark's Letters to *Dodwell*, 1718, are also very conclusive to the same purpose. "Consciousness, in the most strict and exact sense of the word, is the reflex act by which I know that I think, and that my thoughts and actions are my own and not anothers." Now "if the *brain or spirits* be the subject of consciousness, and the parts of the brain or spirits be in perpetual flux or change; it will follow that consciousness, by which I not only remember that certain things were done many years since, but also am conscious that they were done by *me*, by the very *same conscious being* who now remembers them: it will follow that that *consciousness* is transferred from one subject to another; that is to say, that it is a real quality, which subsists without inhering in any subject at all." P. 102. Again.

"If my present consciousness be nothing but a mode of motion in the fleeting particles of my brain and spirits; this consciousness will be as utterly destroyed at the dissolution of my body, as if the very substance of my body was annihilated. And it would be just as possible for the same individual person to be created again, after an absolute annihilation, as to be restored again after such a dissolution." P. 195, 196.

5. It appears therefore that if the soul were not distinct from the body there could be no *Judgment to come*, nor future state of *rewards and punishments*, after this life; it being manifestly unjust to judge and reward or punish one intelligent being for the behaviour of another. And, I add, it is equally certain that on the same principles there could be no *preparation* for happiness hereafter by any *holy dispositions or habits* of piety and virtue here. For after the body, that is, according to this system, the

whole man is dissolved by death, and returned to dust; after he is consumed in flames and reduced to ashes; after these ashes have manured the ground are grown into grass and have been eaten by cattle; after the whole of the matter of which the man was composed is resolved into its first principles whether earth, water, air or fire, where do the *holy tempers* and *devout affections* inhere, whereby the man was fitted for heaven and made *meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light*? In what *subject* are we to look for these *qualities*? Where are we to seek his faith, hope and love? his humility, resignation and patience? His meekness, gentleness and long-suffering; His purity, peace and joy, which constituted that *divine nature* of which he was a *partaker*, the *image of the heavenly* to which he was restored, the *robe of righteousness*, the *garment of salvation*, with which the Lord had adorned him, that he might be fit to appear *at the marriage supper of the Lamb*? Are we to look for them in the dust or ashes, in the grass or corn, in the earth or water, air or fire into which the particles of matter that composed the man are resolved? Alas! these are all senseless and unconscious substances, and incapable of supporting *qualities* that demand *thought* and *intelligence* in the subject possessed of them.

6. According to Dr. Priestley these holy dispositions were nothing but *mechanical* motions and impulses, and now the machine is taken to pieces and they exist no more. They could be nothing according to *any system* but *qualities*, and there is now no *subject* in which they can possibly inhere. They can only have place in a *conscious, thinking* being, and such a being is now no more. The *whole man* is now inanimate matter, is fish or flesh, or grass or corn, or dust or ashes, or earth or water, or air or fire, and is no longer capable of such

such dispositions and affections—They are therefore fled for ever; they are utterly and for ever perished, together with the subject of them, the *thinking thing*, the *self-conscious, intelligent being* in which they were. And if ever they exist again there must be, to all intents and purposes, a *new creation*: a creation both of the *subject* and its *qualities*, both of the soul and its endowments; nor will their having existed in time past be any preparation, for their existing in time to come, any more than the fruitfulness of a tree, which once existed, but is now consumed in fire, is a preparation for its becoming fruitful again, or than the *whiteness* of last winter's snow which is now dissolved into water, is a preparation for its being white again next winter.—The *well of water*, that should have sprung up into *eternal life*, being opened in a perishable soil, is clean dried up and gone: The *lamp* that should have burned till the bridegroom came, is quite extinguished, not indeed for want of *oil* to supply it, but because the *wick* is all consumed and the *vessel* itself broken. The very *ground*, where the good seed, which should have yielded fruit an hundred fold, was sown, is undermined and sunk and the *seed* and its *produce* are perished for ever!

7. It is plain therefore, that on these principles, the whole Scripture doctrine of *Sanctification*, as also the doctrine of the *wisest* and *best* *heathens* concerning the necessity of being prepared for happiness hereafter, by habits of piety and virtue here, has no foundation whatever to support it, nor any grounds or reasons left on which it can be built or whereby it can be urged. For if I myself, as a conscious thinking being, cease at death, and together with me all my holy tempers and heavenly graces whereby I was prepared and made meet for the vision and enjoyment of God and the society of

angels and saints, on what foundation must I be taught the necessity of this holiness, *without which*, however, *no man shall see the Lord*, and to what end must it be urged upon me? Why must I take pains to get what I am sure to lose, and to enrich my soul with those spiritual graces and heavenly endowments of which death will certainly rob me? Why must I, with infinite labour, erect a building on a foundation that cannot support, but will certainly sink under it, the moment it is finished? Why must I with great expence and toil, prepare myself for the marriage supper of the Lamb, by putting on a garment which must certainly be torn off again and destroyed before the bridegroom comes, or the supper be prepared? Why must I light a lamp, which I know death will extinguish before I can go forth to meet the Bridegroom? or furnish with oil, a vessel that is formed of such corruptible materials, that it cannot possibly preserve it, till I want it? As sure therefore as this system of materialism destroys the whole scripture doctrine of *present holiness* as a *preparation, qualification and meetness*, for future happiness, so sure it is not of God nor founded in the *truth* and *nature* of things.

8. These things are said on the supposition that it is not absurd, which nevertheless it certainly is, to imagine that *thought* and *consciousness* or even *perception* can be the result of any possible arrangement of mere matter, or that it can be superadded to it without making it *spirit* or at least implying, that what is so superadded, is a being distinct from matter and capable of living in a state of separation. Dr. Priestley however is of another mind. "It is said (says he *Disq.* P. 82.) we can have no conception how sensation or thought can arise from matter, they being things so very different from it, and bearing no sort of resemblance to any thing like *figure* or *motion*: which is all that can
" result

“ result from any modification of matter or any operation upon it. But (he is sure) this is an argument which derives all its force from our *ignorance*.” Many will think quite the contrary, viz. that it derives all its force from our *knowledge*, and that the more experiments we make, and the more we know of the nature and properties of matter, the more we are convinced that no possible alteration of its form or arrangement of its parts, can produce *perception, thought and intelligence*.

9. He goes on “ Different as are the properties of sensation and thought from such as are usually ascribed to matter, they may nevertheless inhere in the same substance, unless we can shew them to be absolutely *incompatible* with one another.”

God certainly can unite an immaterial, spiritual being, whose property it is to *perceive* and *think* with matter, whose property it is to be *solid* and *extended*; and God can change *matter*, into *spirit*, and *spirit* into *matter*, or rather can create or annihilate one or the other as he pleases: but to suppose that *matter as matter* can be made to *think* by the mere altering of its figure, or arranging its parts in a different manner or putting them into this or that motion, is contrary to all the ideas we have of it, and if we should see such a thing done with regard to any particular portion of it, great or small, the conclusion we should draw would not be that that particular portion of it, by a different modification, had gained a new *property* or *quality*, but that there was a real creation of a new substance or that a spiritual being was united to it.

10. Dr. Clark speaks much to the purpose on this point. “ Some ingenious persons in the present age (says he) have indeed, undertaken to maintain, that God, by the immediate exercise of his omnipotence, may make matter *think*: notwithstanding it be impossible that thinking should result

naturally from any composition or division of the original properties of matter. I suppose they meant that to matter disposed in a certain manner, and put into some particular modes of motion, omnipotence could superadd the power of thinking. But that any *mode of motion* should be *thinking* itself; when all the matter supposed to be in that motion is acknowledged otherwise to be void of thought: *this* is such an extravagant absurdity, as may justly cause wonder how it should ever enter into the heart of any rational man, especially in an age wherein philosophical knowledge has received so considerable improvements." P. 170, 171.

"Unless matter were *essentially* conscious, that is, unless it were essentially endued with *actual thinking*; it might be proved from its *divisibility*, that no system of it, in any possible composition or division, could ever be an individual conscious being; that is could ever either actually think, or attain a capacity of thinking." P. 174.

11. In the following words he effectually answers one of Dr. Priestley's principle arguments. "Defects, discomposures of the brain &c. do not prove that the soul itself is a *bodily organ*; but only that it *acts upon*, or is *acted upon* by *bodily organs*; and is assisted by them, as instruments in its operations. Experience shews us that the sight is bettered by good telescopes, and the hearing by instruments of conveying sounds; but not that these instruments therefore hear or see: that all sensations are bettered by good organs of sense; but not that the organs themselves are *sensible*: that imagination and memory depend on the brain, but not that the brain *imagines* or *remembers*.—The organs of the senses are entirely distinct from one another; but the thing which perceives by those different organs is one and the same thing, one thinking being, which every man calls *himself*. All its powers are the powers

powers of the *whole*, and all its actions are the actions of the *whole*. And if this one substance has no parts that can act separately, it may as well be conceived to have none that can exist separately; and so to be absolutely indivisible." P. 175, 176.

12. But it is not my intention to spend time in arguing upon philosophical principles, when principles much more *certain* and *infallible* are at hand. I shall therefore drop this argument and appeal to the holy Scriptures to decide the point, when I have just observed that it is "the power of *simple perception*, or our consciousness of the presence "and effect of sensations and ideas," that alone creates the difficulty with the Doctor. For "he "takes it for granted that this one property of the "mind being admitted, all the particular phænomena of sensation and ideas, respecting their "retention, association &c. and the various faculties of the mind—as *memory, judgment, volition, the passions, &c.* will admit of a satisfactory illustration, on the principles of vibration, which is "an affection of a material substance." So that according to the Doctor *love and hatred, desire and aversion, hope and fear, joy and sorrow, nay and thinking, reasoning, remembering, resolving*, together with the most refined and abstracted operations of the mind, bear some resemblance to, and may be easily illustrated by the vibrating of a string or cord or other material substance! Surely it requires more faith to be a *materialist* than to be a *Christian*!

SECTION.

S E C T I O N III.

AS Dr. Priestley is a *Divine*, as well as a Philosopher, and instructs, in the principles of Christianity, a congregation of Protestant-Dissenters at *Birmingham*, at the same time that he enlightens *Europe* and the *world* with his *philosophical disquisitions* and researches; so he would fain persuade mankind that his doctrine respecting the *materiality* of man, and his having no *soul*, no *rational* and *immortal* principle that will survive the grave, is the very doctrine of Scripture. The confidence with which he speaks respecting this matter, will, I doubt not, astonish the reader, and when contrasted with the passages of holy writ here produced, will shew him that Dr. Priestley's word is not always to be taken without further examination, no, not when he affirms things most *peremptorily*.

2. Thus *Disquis.* P. 114. "Nothing can be found in those books (the Scriptures) to countenance the vulgar opinion," (that is, that the *soul* is distinct from and outlives the *body*) "except a few passages, ill-translated, or ill-understood, standing in manifest contradiction to the rest." P. 119. "To interpret what the Scriptures say of the *mortality of man*, which is the uniform language of the Old and New Testament on this subject, of the mortality of the *body only*, which is a part of the man that is of the least value, and wholly insignificant, when compared with the other part of his constitution, the *mind*, is exactly of a piece with the Trinitarian interpretation of those passages in the Gospels, which represent
"Christ

" Christ as inferior to his Father, of his *human na-*
 " *ture only.*" P. 124. " The doctrine of a separate
 " soul, most evidently embarrasses the true Chris-
 " tian system, which takes no sort of notice of it
 " and is uniform and consistent without it." " Per-
 " sons who attend to the Scripture cannot avoid
 " concluding, that the operations of the soul de-
 " pend upon the body; and that between death
 " and the resurrection, there will be a suspension
 " of all its powers." P. 125. " If we search the
 " Scriptures for passages, more particularly expres-
 " sive of the state of man at death, we find in them,
 " not only no trace of *sense, thought, or enjoyment,*
 " but on the contrary, such declarations as ex-
 " pressly exclude it." P. 165. " This is precisely
 " the Apostle Paul's idea of the resurrection of
 " the dead as the only foundation of a future life."
 P. 224. " It was unquestionably the opinion of the
 " Apostles and early Christians, that whatever be
 " the soul, its percipient and thinking powers
 " cease at death, and they had no hope of the re-
 " storation of those powers, but in the general re-
 " surrection of the dead." P. 246 and 247. " Ac-
 " cording to revelation, death is a state of rest and
 " insensibility, and our only, though sure hope of
 " a future life is founded on the doctrine of the
 " resurrection of the whole man at some distant
 " period." Nay and he assures us in the same page
 that " it has been to an attentive study of the Scrip-
 " tures, chiefly, and not so much to the considera-
 " tion of natural phænomena, that he is indebted"
 for his system, finding there " a total and remark-
 " able silence, concerning the unembodied state of
 " man: Death is there considered as a state of
 " oblivion and insensibility, and that it is only at
 " the general resurrection of the human race, that
 " the rewards of virtue and the punishments of
 " vice are expressly said to commence." And one
 more

more P. 252. "That the doctrine of revelation concerning a future life, depends on the resurrection of the dead, and has no other foundation whatever. No other ground of hope is so much as hinted at in any part of the Old or New Testament."

3. In answer to these repeated and peremptory assertions of Dr. Priestley, I would observe that the *immortality of the soul* being as truly a doctrine of *natural religion* as the *existence of a deity* and as such, being known and acknowledged in all nations, is not indeed *professedly* and of *set purpose* taught us in the holy Scriptures, any more than the *being of a God* is professedly and of set purpose taught us there. But let the Christian reader weigh the following passages and then say whether it be true that there is "a remarkable and total silence" in the Scriptures concerning such a state and that "there is not so much as a hint of any such state in any part of the Old or New Testament." Let the reader here recollect Dr. Hunter's comment upon our Lord's reply to the Sadduces, quoted in the Title page. It contains at once the *true reason* and a *just reproof* of these many rash and unscriptural assertions. "*Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. Not knowing the Scriptures, ye suppose a doctrine is not in them because ye have not found it in them. Because ye have shut your own eyes, ye vainly imagine there is no light in the Sun; and take upon you to affirm it. Not knowing the power of God, you call that impossible which you cannot do, deem that absurd which you do not comprehend, and pronounce that false which you wish to be so.*"

4. This being premised, I observe 1st, that the distinction between *soul* and *body* is plainly pointed out in the account Moses has given us of the Origin of both. *The Lord God* (says he Gen. ii. 7.) *formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils*

nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul. Now man is here represented as deriving his original from two different quarters, though as to both, by the power of God. One part is formed out of the dust of the ground, and the other part is immediately inspired by God, and though together they make *one living soul*, (or as the words נפש חיה plainly mean several times in the preceding Chapter and in other places *one living Creature*) yet are they manifestly distinguished from each other. The *machine, house or tabernacle* was formed of the dust of the ground, was finished and had a *real and separate existence*, before the *living principle, the conscious, thinking being*, was created by God and sent into it, to animate, use and inhabit it.

5. But Dr. Priestley views this passage in a different light. "We see here (says he, *Disq. P. 115.*) "that the whole man (for nothing is said of his "body in particular) was made of the dust of the "ground. No part of him is said to have had a "higher or different original, and surely so very "important a circumstance as that of an *immaterial "principle*, which could not be from the *dust*, "would not have been omitted, if there had been "any such thing in the composition." "We see "here that the whole man was made of the dust of "the ground!" We see quite the reverse. The words of Moses, literally translated are *The Lord God formed man dust out of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the soul (or spirit) of lives and man became a living soul* or living creature. See the Heb.* Now can any words more clearly express the two constituent parts of man and their different origin? First, He is formed *dust out of the ground*: This was *one part*: it was *dust*, a composition of dust taken out of the ground: And to this the Lord refers, when

* וינער יהוה אלהים את האדם עפר מן הארצה

when, passing sentence upon man after the fall, he says *Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.* But was this dust from the ground the *whole man*, as Dr. Priestley affirms? Surely not! unless a dead carcase, a lump of lifeless clay, be a *whole man*. For after this was formed and completed in all its parts, still there was neither *life* nor *perception*, and much less *thought* or *intelligence*, till the Lord God did something further, and *breathed into his nostrils* (speaking after the manner of men) *the soul of lives*. This is the *other part* of man, נשמה חיים, the *soul of lives*, the principle of *life*, *perception* and *intelligence*. And of this Buxtorf justly observes, * *The Hebrews by this word understand the rational and immortal soul, whence they are accustomed also to swear by this.* And Leigh in his *Critica Sacra* quotes Schlindlerus to the same purpose as follows, § *It is used of man only and denotes his rational soul.* This indeed may be carrying the matter rather too far, as the same word seems Gen. vii. 22. to be used of all living creatures; but certainly it is usually applied to man, and in divers passages signifies (as Buxtorff observes) his *rational* and *immortal spirit*. See Job xxvii. 3, xxxiv. 14. Is. lvii. 16. Heb. Now, instead of this, if Dr. Priestley's doctrine were true, if *life*, *perception* and *thought* were the *necessary result* of that particular arrangement of matter, which composes the human brain, this would have been needless, and as soon as the body had been perfectly finished and the brain completely formed, *sensation* and *intelligence* would have been the *immediate consequence*; and man would have been a *living soul*, or a *living creature* without the Lord's doing any thing further. So that

* Hebræi per נשמה intelligunt animam rationalem et immortalem, unde et per hanc jurare solunt.

§ Usurpatur de homine tantum et animam ejus ratione præditam denotat.

that something is "said of his body in particular," viz. that it was *formed* *dust out of the ground*, of which the *whole man* was not made, and a part of him is said to have had an *higher and different* original, even the *vivifying and creating* inspiration of the Lord God, who breathed into him a *living soul*.

6. Indeed, the Doctor is constrained, in effect, to acknowledge this in what follows. "When the "whole man (says he; he should have said the "body of man) was completely formed, and not "before, we are next informed that God made "this man, who was lifeless at first, to breathe and live." Who was lifeless at first! How came he to be lifeless? It seems he was completely formed in every part; even his brain was finished. And according to the Doctor, "sensation and "thought belong to the brain, as much as gravity "and magnetism belong to other arrangements of "matter." I should have thought he not only would have *lived*, but even have been in possession of *perception and intelligence*, the moment he was formed and the matter of his brain properly arranged. For says the Doctor "what we call *mind*, "or the principle of perception and thought is not "a substance distinct from the body, but the result "of corporeal organization." But (adds he) "it "is evident from the text that nothing but the cir- "cumstance of breathing made the difference be- "tween the unanimated earth, and the living soul." *The circumstance of breathing!* Does he mean the Lord's breathing (speaking after the manner of men) or man's breathing? If the *latter*, we utterly deny it, as contrary to the express letter of the text; if the *former* he allows the very thing we contend for. The Lord God *breathed into his nostrils the soul of lives* that is inspired into him a *living, thinking and intelligent* principle. But "it is not said that when "one constituent part of the man was made,

C

"another

“another constituent part of a very different nature “was superadded to it, and that these two united “constituted the man.” The words “constituent part,” are not indeed mentioned by Moses: but the same thing, in substance, is affirmed, that the Lord God formed man, *dust* of the ground, which was one constituent part, and afterwards superadded the soul of life or lives, and that by the union of these two, man became a *living soul*, or *living creature*.

7. And that we understand *Moses* right in the account which he here gives of the origin of man, is plain from the following words of the Prophet Zechariah Ch. xii. v. 1. *Thus saith the Lord who stretcheth* or (for it seems it should rather be rendered in the *past* time) *who stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundation of the earth and formed the spirit of man* *האדם* of Adam *within him*. A sufficiently clear proof (as one justly observes) that these three things, the stretching forth the heavens, the laying the foundation of the earth, and the forming the rational soul of man within him, go hand in hand. They are works of equal difficulty and importance, and were done at the same time, that is within the six days in which the Lord God created the heavens and the earth and all that is therein. Hence St. Peter exhorts us to *commit the keeping of our souls to him as to a faithful Creator*. Now it is a just remark of Mr. Flavel that “the substantial nature of the soul is implied in these passages, for whatsoever is created is a substance, an *ens per se*, accidents not being properly said to be created.” Besides, we are assured by Moses that, before the Creation of Man, God said, *Let us make man, in our image, and after our likeness*, and that accordingly,
God

“Testimonium satis clarum quo docemur pari passu hæc tria ambulare, expansionem cæli, foundationem terræ et formationem animæ rationalis.”

God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him. Now if, as our Lord declares; God be a *Spirit*, how could man be created in *his image*, if he had *no spirit* in him, but was wholly made of matter, as a river consists wholly of water or a forrest of trees? Dr. *Priestley* perhaps will answer God is not a *spirit*, but a Material being; and therefore man, though wholly material, might still be his image. But, I think, in this point few of my readers will agree with him.

8. But this is not the only passage of Scripture that confirms our interpretation of Gen. ii. 7. The same infallible Spirit that dictated it, has condescended in another place to ratify the plain and obvious sense we put upon it, and (which I hope will have some weight with the *Doctor*) by the pen of a great *Naturalist*, a *wise* and *learned Philosopher*, of whom even Dr. *Priestley* need not be ashamed to learn. I proceed therefore to observe, *secondly*, That the argument drawn from the brief account here given by Moses of the origin of Man, will receive a perfect illustration and additional strength, by comparing it with what Solomon has said, with a plain reference to it, concerning the *end* of man, I mean as to the present life. Speaking in figurative terms concerning the dissolution of the wonderful fabric of man's body, (the *anatomy* of which he seems to have perfectly understood) he observes Eccles. xii. 7. *Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God that gave it.* Here he plainly distinguishes the *dust* which was taken from the earth and returns to it, from the *spirit* which was *given* (that is immediately inspired) by God and returns to him. To say that the spirit here means the *breath* whereby animal life is continued, would be absurd, because this, properly speaking, no more returns to God than the body itself does. No, this intermixes with the air, or rather is nothing

but the air itself, inspired and expired by means of the lungs, and of no further use when the lungs cease to perform their office. This is as truly *material* as any fluid or solid parts of the body, yea as the blood or bones are, and is included in the dust which returns to its original. But that which returns to that Being who is properly a *Spirit*, is itself a *spirit* like him to whom it returns, that is, a *conscious, thinking, immortal* substance.

9. And that I do not mistake or misrepresent the meaning of the inspired penman seems evident from a similar declaration of St. Paul, in the 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, v. 10, 11. *If Christ be in you the body indeed is dead, because of sin, because of the fall of our first parents and the corruption we derive from them; but the spirit (or soul) is life, or (as some copies read, ζῷ instead of ζωῇ) lives because of righteousness, because of our justification and regeneration, through faith in Christ.* There may be other ways of understanding and explaining this passage, but none so natural and easy, none that preserve the *Antithesis* so plainly intended by the Apostle, First between the *body* and *soul* (here as in a thousand places called *spirit*) Secondly between the *death* of the one and the *life* of the other, and Thirdly between the causes of these, *sin* and *righteousness*. The *soul* is here manifestly distinguished from the *body* and is said *to be life* or *to live*, that is to exist in happiness through righteousness, while the latter dies through sin. And that this is the meaning of the Apostle appears still more from what follows: *And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.* As if he had said, Your *spirit*, or *soul*, lives without dying at all, lives even when the body dies, and your *very mortal body*,
(not

(not your *soul* or *spirit*) is to be raised to life again, by the *Spirit of God that dwelleth in you*.

10. And here let me point out one instance, among many more that might be given, of Dr. Priestley's great *rashness* (to say the least of it) in his assertions. He tells (*Hist. of Cor. P. 402.*) "it is observable that this (the resurrection) is *never* in the Scripture called the resurrection of *the body* (as if the soul in the mean time were in some other place) but always the resurrection of *the dead*, that is of the man. If, therefore, there be any intermediate state, in which the soul alone exists, conscious of any thing, there is an absolute silence concerning it in Scripture, death being always spoken of there, as a state of *rest of silence* and of *darkness*, a place where *the wicked cease from troubling*, but where the righteous *cannot praise God*." Here at least we have an instance (and there are others See Phil. iii. 21. 1. Cor. xv. 44) where the resurrection is expressly called the resurrection of the *body*, and of the body as distinguished from the *soul*, which in the mean time is said to be alive. And as to this "intermediate state in which the soul alone *exists*" and is *conscious*, it is plain even from hence and I hope will be more plain by and by, that there is not an "absolute silence concerning it in the Scripture."

11. But to return: What tolerable sense can any man make of the Apostle's words on the contrary hypothesis, which supposes, either that the *soul* is no way distinct from the *body*, or that it dies along with it? According to this doctrine the Apostle should have said, "If Christ be in you, yet still remember your *body* must die, because of sin, and your *soul* too, (if you have any principle within you that can be called by that name) though possessed of righteousness: And the whole of you must continue in death till the resurrection. But if the

Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised Christ from the dead shall, at that period, quicken your *mortal soul* by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." For as the materialists understand nothing else by the soul but the *life* of the body, so they suppose that we lose it at death, and that it is restored at the general resurrection. In answer to which I would just observe, that the Scripture no where speaks of the resurrection of the *soul* or *spirit* at the great day, but always of the resurrection of the *body* and of that as a thing *distinct* from the soul (as in the text) and of that *only*.

12. But again: that the *soul* is a thing distinct from the body and does not die with it, is plain to a demonstration from the words of our Lord, Math. x. 28. *Fear not them that can kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell.* Here certainly an immortal principle is spoken of and called the *soul*, which is distinguished from the body and concerning which it is affirmed that it *cannot be killed*, even when the body is killed. But if the soul be merely the result of corporeal organization, how can the body be killed and its *life* not killed? Can a man throw a snow-ball into the fire and destroy the *snow* and not destroy its whiteness? If any reply that our Lord means that the *soul* or *life* of the body cannot be killed *for ever*, cannot so be killed, but that it shall be restored again, I answer the same may be said of the *body*: it cannot be killed *for ever*; it cannot so be killed but that it shall be raised again. For God shall *quicken, even our mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in us.* So that if that were all our Lord meant he has expressed his meaning very unhappily, and has both made a distinction without a difference, and also affirmed a *plain falsehood*, declaring that the *body* may be killed, but that the *soul* cannot: Whereas according to this doctrine,
the

the soul and the body are no way distinct from each other, but are *one thing*, and either they can *neither* be killed, viz. *for ever*, or they may *both* be killed *for a time*. Our Lord adds what manifestly confirms the obvious and plain sense of the passage, *Fear him who can destroy both body and soul in hell*, observe both *body* and *soul*, for the *body* as distinguished from the *soul* shall be raised again and have its share in the misery of the ungodly.

13, The manner in which Dr. Priestley gets over this passage is something curious. "Our Saviour, indeed, (says he, *Disq.* P. 129) seems to use the term *soul* as expressive of something distinct from the body, (Math. x. 28) but if he did (which however is not certain) he might do it in compliance with the prevailing opinion of the times, in the same manner as he applied the term *possessed* of Demons to mad-men and even speaks to mad-men as if they were actuated by evil spirits, though he certainly did not believe the existence of such demons." Such is the opinion which the Doctor has of our Lord as a *divine teacher*, the *only* character in which he receives him! He supposes that in compliance with the prevailing opinion of the times, he represented mad-men as possessed of demons when he knew perfectly they were not possessed of them, nay knew that such demons did not exist, and that he affirmed a plain falsehood, even to his own disciples, as well as made a distinction without a difference! and further, that on this *false foundation* he grounded an exhortation to them which, on the Doctor's hypothesis, is most unreasonable and absurd! For is *conscious existence*, including *perception* and *intelligence* and attended with *knowledge*, *holiness*, *happiness*, *piety*, *virtue*, the enjoyment of *God himself* and the *whole Creation* here below, so worthless a thing, that I must not so much as *fear* the man that can deprive me of it,
for

for thousands of years, and make me as insensible as a stock or a stone? Nay that can reduce me to the *dust* out of which I was taken and bring me back to my first principles? Surely he that has power to do all this is really an object of *fear*. And it seems to me, that on the Doctor's principles, the exhortation of our Lord should have been diametrically opposite to what it is, and he should have said, "Fear them who can kill the *body*, for at the same time that they do this, they kill the *soul* also and reduce you to a condition below that of the *vilest insect*, they render you *inanimate matter*, *senseless* and *inactive*: They *separate you from the love of Christ*, nay and deprive you of all your knowledge of God, love to him and enjoyment of him, as also of all ability to serve him or to be of any use to your fellow creatures; they make you mere dust and ashes. Remember, Solomon has told you a *living dog is better than a dead lion*: fear them therefore, be on your guard against them and continue in life as long as you can, as well for your own good, because, in almost every situation and circumstance *life is sweet*, as for the glory of God and the good of your fellow creatures."

14. But, adds the Doctor, "when we consider that according to the uniform tenor of the Scriptures, and especially our Saviours own discourses and parables, there is no punishment in hell till after the resurrection, it will be evident his meaning could only be, that men have power over us in this life, but, God in the life to come." How far the Doctor is right with regard to what he says of "*the uniform tenor of the Scriptures and our Saviour's own discourses and parables*," is partly seen already and will be more fully seen by and by. In the mean time, I would observe, if our Lord meant no more than the Doctor supposes him to mean, he has expressed his meaning very unhappily,

pily, for his words are most exprefs that there is a part in man which *cannot be killed*, no, not when the body *is killed*, and that man has *no power* over this after death, but that God could both destroy *this* in Hell and raife up the *body* alfo to fhare in the torment. But, it feems, he only fpoke thus “ in compliance with the opinion of the times in the fame manner as he applied the term *possessed of demons* to *mad-men* and even fpoke to mad-men as if they “ were actuated by evil fpirits, though he certainly “ did not believe the exiftence of fuch demons.” But why is the *Doctor* fo pofitive that our Lord did not believe the exiftence of fuch demons? Why? Because the *Doctor* does not believe it, and he is fure neither Chrift himfelf nor any of his Apoftles believed any thing which he does not believe! However, our Lord had policy enough, it feems, to fpeak and act *as if* he believed it, and accordingly very frequently commanded the unclean fpirits to come out of both men and women, when he knew perfectly there were none in! and directed his evangelifts to record in writing, divers instances of numbers, yea of *legions*, being actually caft out, when not one fuch instance had ever happened in fact!

15. I beg leave to make another remark here. In a paffage immediately following his obfervations upon this text in the xth of Math. the Doctor fays, “ Had the f acred writers really believed the exiftence of the foul, as a principle in the human “ conftitution, naturally diftinct from and independent of the body, it cannot but be fuppofed “ that they would have made fome ufe of it, in their “ arguments for a future life. But it is remarkable “ we find no fuch argument in all the New Testament.” No? What not in thefe words, *Fear not them that can kill the body but are not able to kill the foul*? Is there no intimation here of “ a principle in the human conftitution, naturally diftinct from and independent

independent of the *body*? And is there “no use made of this principle, in our Lord’s argument for a future life?” And can the Doctor find nothing of the same kind in any other part of the New Testament? If not, I will refer him to 2 Cor. v. 1.—9. and Phil. 1. 21—23. Surely the Doctor must know, what I am afraid is too true, that *his readers*, in general are but little acquainted with the Scriptures, or, one would suppose, he would be *ashamed* to assert so frequently, what so manifestly contradicts the *very letter of them*.

16. But to proceed. This same doctrine, that the soul is a principle distinct from the body and capable of existing in a separate state is also implied in the account which St. Paul has given us, probably of himself 2. Cor. xii, 2, 3. *I knew a man in Christ* (says he) *fourteen years ago* (*whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth*) *such an one caught up to the third heaven: I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth) how that he was caught up into paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter.* Now though this passage do not speak of what shall be after death, yet it plainly distinguishes the *soul* from the *body*, and declares it to have been the Apostles belief that the soul might be separated from the body even before death and might be caught up into Paradise, yea and into the third heaven, and there *think and know and see and hear* things unutterable. The Apostle indeed is uncertain whether he had been caught up *in the body or out of the body*, that is; whether his *whole man* had been caught up, *body and soul* both, or whether only his *soul* had been taken out of the body and caught up in that state of separation, while his body was left below and laid asleep. But if the soul were not a principle distinct from the body and capable of living

Qua

out of it, there would have been no room for this doubt, but the Apostle might have been *sure* that he was caught up, not *out of* but *in* the body.

17. Again: That the *soul* is distinct from the body and will exist when the body dies, is plain from both St. Paul and St. Peter's comparing the *body* to an *house* or *tabernacle* and the *soul* to the *inhabitant* thereof, or the *body* to *clothing* and the *soul* to the *person* clothed therewith. St. Paul's words are 2. Cor. v. 1—4. *If the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens.* He afterwards speaks of being *unclothed*, that is, *stript* of the body, or as he explains it, *absent from it*. The very same is the language of St. Peter 2. Epist. Ch. i. 13 and 14. *I think it meet (says he) as long as I am in this tabernacle to stir you up by putting you in remembrance, knowing that shortly I must put off this tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me.* Now what a strange and unintelligible way of speaking is *this*, if the *soul* is no way distinct from the body, but only a mere *property*, the result of corporeal organization, which dies and is extinct when the body dies? Do we ever speak of *mere properties* in this manner? Does the Doctor *himself*, though so confident that the *soul* as much belongs to the brain and is as truly a mere property thereof, as *Magnetism* belongs to the *Loadstone* and is the result of that particular arrangement of matter, does *he* (I say) ever speak of *Magnetism* in this manner, and tell people of its being *unclothed* of the *Loadstone*? Or do we speak thus of *brute Creatures*, though their life is surely more than a *property*? Do we ever say when they die, that *their earthly house is dissolved*, that they have *put off their tabernacle*, and are *unclothed and absent from the body*? No certainly. Such language would be absurd, at least in the mouths of those who do not believe
that

that they have an intelligent and immortal principle in them that survives the body. Why then is not the same way of speaking absurd, when applied to man? Certainly because man has in him a *mind, spirit* or *intellectual* part, which *survives* the body and is *immortal*. This now uses the body as an instrument, while in this material world, but will, by and by, lay it aside as having no use for it in the spiritual world, at least in its present, gross state: *This* now dwells in the body as in an *house*, or sojourns in it as in a *tent*, but will shortly remove out of it into a much more *pure* and *commodious* habitation: *This* is now clothed with the body as with a garment, but will ere long *put it off* and will find prepared for it, if now clothed with the divine image, a much more comfortable and splendid attire.

SECTION IV.

ENOUGH has been said, in the preceding section, to prove to any that believe the Scripture that the soul is distinct from the body and does not die with it, but exist in a separate state. In this Section I shall endeavour to prove that it does not *sleep* in that state of separation, but is in a condition of *conscious happiness* or *misery*.

1. They who hold this opinion, who imagine that the soul has a *real, distinct* and *separate* existence after the body dies, and yet that it falls into a state of *sleep* or *stupor*, in which it has neither *consciousness* nor *activity*, must certainly suppose that it is *material*, as it is not conceivable how an *immaterial* substance, a substance *purely* spiritual, should lose

lose all *thought* and *consciousness* and yet retain any existence. It is granted, if it be *material*, tho' as fine as *air* or even *light*, it is conceivable that it may lose all consciousness and thought (if in that case it ever could have any) and yet retain some kind of existence. But then how it differs from the body is impossible to say; at least it is perfectly clear and certain that it has, in that case, *no pre-eminence* above the body. For the *substance* of the body as truly remains after the animal life departs, as on this hypothesis, the substance of the *soul* is supposed to remain after thought and consciousness cease; and the *body*, according to the Scriptures, will as certainly be raised again to life, as this opinion supposes that the soul shall be restored to its consciousness and activity.

2. Dr. *Priestly*, whose doctrine, as we have seen, is, that we have no *soul at all* that can survive the death of the body, either to *sleep* or *wake*, speaks well to this point Dis. P. 123. "I wish they would consider what notion they really have of an immaterial soul, passing thousands of years, without a single idea or sensation. In my opinion, it approaches very nearly to its being *no substance at all*; just as matter must entirely vanish, when we take away its property of extension."

"If together with the opinion of the entire cessation of thought they will maintain the real *existence* of the soul, it must be for the sake of the *hypothesis* only, and for no real *use* whatever."

This opinion therefore, is more unphilosophical and absurd, (if more can be) than the former. However, as it is not to *Philosophy*, but to *Revelation* that I appeal, I wave proceeding further in this kind of argumentation, and call the attention of my readers to the Oracles of God, as being perfectly able to determine this point, and that in a manner more obvious to the meanest capacity; than *philosophical*

sophistical reasonings, and with an *authority* much more binding upon the conscience, and from which there can be *no appeal*.

3. An attentive reader cannot but have observed, that most of the passages quoted under the former head are equally conclusive in favour of the point I am now to establish, particularly those from the 8th to the Rom. and from the 10th of St. Matthew. For if at death the soul falls into a profound *sleep* or insensible *stupor*, so that it has no *thought* or *consciousness*, how can it be said to *live*, or to be *life* because of righteousness? Surely it dies, to all intents and purposes, as much as the body does, which shall revive at the great day, as well as it. And how can it be said that it cannot be *killed*, tho' the body may? Surely it is as *truly* and as *perfectly* killed as the body is; for the *substance* of the body remains, when its life is gone, as certainly as the substance of this strange kind of soul is supposed to remain when the power of *thought* and *perception* is gone. And how could our Lord, on this hypothesis, with any propriety or force of argument, exhort his disciples *not to fear those that could kill the body, but afterwards had no more that they could do*? Since he that killed the body, at least laid the soul *asleep*, or threw it into a state of *absolute insensibility* for some thousands of years; during which it could have no *consciousness* and of consequence no *enjoyment*: and not being capable of any action, could neither profit itself, nor others, nor in any possible way serve its Creator and Redeemer. Surely this is a state really to be dreaded by a wise and good man, who even in this life, finds an happiness in the knowledge and love of God and of Christ, that overballances his bitterest sorrows; and who, if it were otherwise, would nevertheless still desire to live and be useful, rather than die and fall asleep till the resurrection day!

4. But

4. But our Lord's disciples were sufficiently secured against any fear of that kind by the gracious assurances which Jesus had frequently given them, and all others that should believe in him. For in this light it seems most natural to understand the following and such-like Scriptures, John v. 24. *Who so heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life—is passed from death to life.* Again John vi. 47, 50, 51. *This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. If a man eat of this bread he shall live for ever.* John viii. 51. *Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man keep my saying he shall never taste of death.* And again John xi. 26. *Who so liveth and believeth in me shall never die.* To the same purpose may be mentioned our Lord's words to the woman of Samaria, *The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water, springing up to everlasting life.* Now all these passages are perfectly natural and easy, if the soul of a believer has not only a separate existence after death, but also retains thought and consciousness, or in other words *lives* and is happy. But, on the supposition, that it *ceases to exist* (which I have shewn it does not) or *sleeps* and becomes *insensible* till the resurrection-day, they are very improperly expressed and hard to be understood.

5. But I need not stop to quote and insist upon such texts as these, which are capable, though not with equal ease or so natural an interpretation, of being construed into another sense: There are other passages, and those not a few, which are not capable of being forced into any other meaning, and which prove to a demonstration that the soul *does not sleep*, but is *awake* and *active* in the separate state. Such is the parable of the unfaithful Steward, recorded Luke xvi. v. 1, &c. In that parable our Lord gives the following advice, *Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail*

fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations. Mammon here undoubtedly means *riches or money*, and it is termed the *mammon of unrighteousness*, because of the unrighteous manner in which it is commonly procured or employed. When our Lord bids us *make to ourselves friends* with this, he means that we should do all possible good with it, especially to the children of God. He enforces the exhortation by this motive, *That when ye fail*, that is, when ye die, when *your heart and flesh faileth*, and your earthly tabernacle is dissolved, and not some thousands of years after, *they*, those children of God that are gone before you, whom ye relieved in their distresses and did good unto in the days of their flesh, *may receive you*, may bid you welcome *into everlasting habitations*. Surely our Lord does not mean that we should be received to SLEEP there, or fall into a state of *utter insensibility*, much less after we are already fallen into such a state; but to be *refreshed and comforted* by and among those whom our *love and bounty* refreshed and comforted on earth, in order that in their love and friendship we may for ever enjoy the reward of our pious charity and beneficence.

6. But what tolerable sense can be made of this passage on the supposition of the soul's falling into a *sound sleep*, or becoming utterly insensible at death? On this hypothesis there are none gone before into everlasting habitations to receive such as come after, but all fall into a state of utter insensibility the moment they die, and remain in that state till the general resurrection, when all rise and enter the heavenly mansions together, and not some before others, *some* that had been relieved in their sickness and upon their dying beds, *before* such as had relieved them. There can be no such thing therefore as *some* receiving *others*. And on the same principle, it could with no propriety be said *that when*

when ye fail they may receive you, for none are received *when they fail*, but most part many thousands of years after ; so that this passage contains a very conclusive argument in favour of the doctrine I espouse, and the more it is considered in connexion with the context, the more conclusive it will appear. The unfaithful Steward wished to provide for his reception and entertainment *immediately* upon his being dismissed by his lord, that he might not be destitute at all, and he is represented as being received by his lord's debtors, whom he had befriended, not after he and they had been asleep many years, and being now suddenly awakened were in such circumstances that *he* neither wanted *their* help, nor *they* his ; but *immediately* upon his being turned out of his stewardship.

7. The same important truth that we are in happiness or misery immediately after death, is certainly taught in that well-known passage contained in Rev. xiv. 13.—*I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write : Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth : Yea saith the Spirit that they may rest from their labours ; and their works do follow them.* As the importance of this passage is sufficiently pointed out by the voice from heaven commanding to write it, and the confirmation of it by the testimony of the Spirit ; so if it be considered in the original there can be no reasonable doubt entertained respecting its meaning. For not to insist on the word *μακάριοι* happy are the dead, which however implies their *conscious existence*, for how can they be called *happy*, who do not so much as *exist*, or are not *conscious* that they do ; and not to dwell upon the word *απὸ νῦν*, rendered *henceforth*, but with equal propriety translated, *instantly* or *immediately*, (in which sense the learned *Witfius* takes it, *Wit. Oecon. Fæder.* 3. 14. 21.) *Happy are the dead, that die in the Lord, instantly, they are happy instantly ;—not*

(I say) to insist upon this, the words that follow, spoken by the Spirit, are quite *clear* and *decisive* and incapable of being construed into any other sense, *Yea saith the spirit that they may rest from their labours* *να αναπαύσωνται εκ των κοπων αυτων*, literally *that they may be refreshed*, or (as the word is in the middle voice) *may recreate and refresh themselves from or after their labours*, and *their works follow*, *μετ αυτων*, *with them*, or accompany them. It is well known and will not be denied (I think) that the word *αναπαύω* does not signify barely to *rest*, but to *rest with refreshment and comfort*, as in Math. xi. 28 and 29. *I will refresh you*, you shall find *refreshment* to your souls, and therefore is a word that cannot properly be applied to what is devoid of *life*, *perception*, and *consciousness*. We cannot properly say of inanimate matter, that it is *refreshed* and *comforted*. And the last clause, *Their works follow with them*, or accompany them, surely imply (as Baxter has observed) that they *immediately* enter into happiness as soon as they die, otherwise it should have been said their works come many thousands of years after their death; namely at the resurrection of the great day, when, and not before, according to this system, they are noticed and rewarded.

8. The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches the same doctrine. In the 6th Chapter of that Epistle and v. 12. he exhorts the believing Hebrews *not to be slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises*. Now whom can the Apostle mean by those who *through faith and patience inherit the promises*, but saints departed this life, who being received into the mansions Christ had prepared for them in his Father's house, and beholding the glory the Father had given him, inherited the promises in a much fuller sense than any can do on earth? Surely this is the most natural and easy sense of the passage, and to take it
in

in any other sense is to put a manifest force upon it. To suppose with Mr. Peirce, that the Apostle, here, exhorts the believing *Jews* to imitate the believing *Gentiles*, is without any shadow of reason, not to say absurd. For the believing *Jews*, being in Christ, in general, long before the *Gentiles*, and having much greater advantages, were, it is probable, much more advanced in grace than they. Besides, the *Gentiles* are not so much as mentioned in the whole Epistle, and neither in this Epistle nor any where else (I think) are they proposed as an example to be imitated by the believing *Jews* who were converted before them. And surely he does not exhort a part of the christian Hebrews to imitate others still alive. For he writes to all without exception, commends them for their *work and labour of love which they had shewed to Christ's name in that they had ministered to the saints and did minister*; and he exhorts every one of them, not a part, to imitate the rest, but *all* in general and every individual in particular, *to shew the same diligence they had hitherto shewn, unto the full assurance of hope unto the end, that ye be not slothful* (adds he) *but followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises*. He exhorts, therefore, all the believing Hebrews, still alive; who it seems were already eminent for *love and good works*, to persevere in the good way they were in to the end, in imitation of them who, *through faith and patience*, had finished their course, and were now inheriting the promised rest in glory, having *received the end of their faith the salvation of their souls*. This, I say again, is the plain and obvious sense of the words, and taken in this sense they are utterly irreconcilable with the doctrine of the *sleep of the soul*.

9. And that there are some who inherit the promises, in the separate state is certain in fact according to the the testimony of Scripture. The Evangelists

geliſts inform us (ſee Math. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. and eſpecially Luke ix. 30, 31.) of Moſes and Elias appearing in glory to our Lord on the mount where he was tranſfigured, and diſcourſing with him on the ſubject of *that deceaſe he ſhould accompliſh at Jeruſalem*. Now unleſs we allow that theſe were really the *Spirits* of theſe two great and good men, the former of whom had been under God, the *inſtitutor* and the other the *reformer* of the *Jeruiſh Church*; I do not ſee how we can vindicate the *truth* and *authenticity* of the ſacred hiſtory of the New Teſtament, eſpecially as *Matthews*, *Mark* and *Luke*, all circumſtantially record this event, and affirm that the appearances were not *mere viſions*, but *real perſons*, even *Moſes* and *Elias*. St. *Luke* in particular ſpeaks very expreſſly ſaying there talked with him two men, which were *Moſes* and *Elias*. *Elias*, it is true, as he never died, but was only changed, being carried alive into heaven, probably had his glorified body with him. But *Moſes the Ser- vant of the Lord* really died in the land of *Moab*, according to the word of the Lord, and the Lord buried him in a valley over againſt *Beth-Peor*. See Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6. He therefore, at leaſt, was a diſembodied ſpirit, and made viſible probably by aſſuming ſome vehicle for that purpoſe.

10. But this is not the only paſſage of Scripture where departed ſpirits are repreſented as appearing or are mentioned as exiſting. The *Ghost of Samuel* appeared to *Saul*, and held a particular converſation with him, predicting his approaching death. And as the Apoſtles believed that ſpirits might appear, and more than once ſuppoſed they actually had ſeen one: ſo our Lord himſelf allowed there might be ſuch a thing as a ſpirit appearing, for he reaſons with them upon the notion of it, ſaying *a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones as you ſee me have*. And that they are not aſleep, but in happineſs or miſery,

is certain, on the one hand from what St. Peter says of *the spirits in prison*, and on the other, from the mention which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has made of *the spirits of the just made perfect*. As to the former, if they were fallen into a deep sleep till the resurrection day, it certainly was perfectly needless to confine them in prison, as it is not supposed that they are in any danger of *awaking*: and as to the latter, I know not what kind of *perfection* that could be, which they had attained by sinking into utter *stupidity* and *insensibility*, *unconscious* and *unactive*.

11. But perhaps it may not be amiss, to give each of these last mentioned passages a particular examination. That of St. Peter is in the 1st Epist. Ch. iii. v. 18, 19, 20. *Christ hath once suffered for sins—put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit* (perhaps to preserve the *Antithesis* which seems here to be intended between *flesh* and *spirit*, ζωογονηθεὶς ἐν πνεύματι might be rendered *kept alive in the spirit*) *whereby also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which were formerly disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing*. Dr. Watts justly observes upon this passage that in whatever light the former part of it be interpreted, “Whether Christ preached to these antient Rebels who were destroyed by the flood by his Spirit working in Noah, a Preacher of righteousness; or whether in the three days in which his body lay dead, his soul visited their spirits in their separate state of imprisonment, on which some ground the notion of his descent into Hell: Let this be determined as it will, the most clear and easy sense of the Apostle when he speaks of *the spirits in prison* is that the souls of those Rebels, after their bodies were destroyed by the flood, were reserved in prison for some special and future design. And this is very parallel (adds he) to the present

present circumstances of fallen Angels, of whom Jude has given us an account, v. 6. *The Angels that kept not their first estate he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.* And why may not the spirits of men be as well kept in such a prison as the spirits of Angels?"

12. As to the other passage contained in the 12th to the Hebrews, it so plainly enumerates all the inhabitants of the heavenly world, with whom believers have communion even while on earth, and among them *the spirits of the just made perfect*, that it seems impossible to put any tolerable sense upon it on the principles of those who do not admit the doctrine of a *separate and conscious state* of the soul after death. It mentions *God the Judge of all, Jesus the Mediator of the New-Covenant, an innumerable company of Angels, the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written, or registered in heaven*, (that is all the children of God of all nations and ages, who are enrolled in heaven, as the first born of Israel were enrolled by Moses)---and the *spirits of the just made perfect*, who by putting off the body, with all its infirmities, afflictions and pains, have arrived at a degree of perfection not to be attained on earth. Now if there be no such thing as *any separate state*, in which disembodied spirits *live and are happy*, what shall we make of the Apostle's words? What tolerable sense can we put upon them? on the same principle that we deny *their* existence or maintain that they *sleep*, we might deny the existence of *Angels*, yea of *Jesus Christ* or *God himself*, or assert that those *ever wakeful, ever active* Beings are sealed up in perpetual slumbers: And then what would become of the creation of God, when its *Preserver and Redeemer*, with all the heavenly ministers of his providence
and

and grace, were laid *fast asleep* or were sunk into an *eternal stupor*?

13. A further proof of this point may be very properly brought from what is said concerning the souls of the Martyrs. Rev. vi. 9. (a passage which Dr. Priestley confounds with Rev. xx. 4. See Disq. P. 131.) *When he had opened the 5th Seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth, and white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them that they should rest for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren that should be killed as they were should be fulfilled.* Now though it be allowed that this is a vision (as the greatest part of this book consists of visions) yet it is a vision founded on *truth* which it could not be, if neither the Martyrs, nor any others departed this life, had souls existing and living in a separate state. And why may we not suppose that the whole passage gives us a true representation of a matter of fact? viz. "that (as Dr. Watts says) the spirits of the Martyrs which are now with God, pray him to hasten the accomplishment of his promises made to his church and the day of vengeance upon his irreconcilable enemies." Surely this is the most easy, obvious, and natural sense of the passage, and considering the confirmation it receives from the uniform doctrine of Scripture concerning the existence and state of the soul after death, it is undoubtedly the true one.

14. And that the doctrine of Scripture is what I am endeavouring to establish, viz. that the soul does not *sleep*, but is in a state of *conscious happiness* or *miserery*, is not only sufficiently plain from the many passages I have already produced, but also and especially

cially from that remarkable account our Lord himself hath given us, Luke xvi. v. 13—31. *The beggar died and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, the rich man also died and was buried, and in Hell he lift up his eyes, being in torment, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom; and he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, &c.*

15. Many are inclined to think that this is not a *Parable*, but an historical relation of a matter of fact which our Lord knew had actually happened. And in that case the matter is established beyond a doubt: there is no room for any reasoning upon the subject, our Lord himself positively affirming, not only that the *souls* of these two persons *existed* after their bodies *died*, but that the soul of the one was *comforted* and that of the other *tormented*, which things are neither of them consistent with a state of *stupor* or *insensibility*. But supposing this passage of Scripture be not a *true history*, but only a *Parable*, yet still it will furnish most convincing evidence of the *existence* and *happiness* or *misery* of separate spirits. For though it be a *Parable*, or parabolical representation of things, it certainly must be founded, not on a *lie*, but on *truth*, and intended, not to mislead us into error, but to teach us *truth*. But on the principles of the doctrine I oppose, it is founded on a *lie* and intended to teach a *lie*.

16. The whole *Parable*, if it be a *Parable*, is built on this supposition, that there is *another* and *spiritual* world into which persons enter immediately after death, and where they generally experience a strange reverse of the state they were in here, and that this world exists even *now*, while men are still alive upon earth in a state of trial. This is the *foundation* of the *Parable*; and if this be all a mere fiction, then the *Parable* is founded on a *lie*; it
takes

takes for granted what has no existence. *Secondly*, The Parable is intended to teach us, that those, who instead of making a proper use of the good things of this life, take up with them as their portion and live luxuriously, shall, immediately after death, be *tormented*; and that those who suffer evil things here, if they be patient under them, resigned to the will of God, and truly pious, shall, the moment after they die, be conveyed to a place where they shall be proportionably *comforted*. But if there be no such after-state of torment or comfort to commence as soon as we die, then our Lord here *misleads* and teaches us a *lie*, and on the one hand terrifies us with *false fears* of what has no existence, and on the other encourages us with *vain hopes* of what is not and never can be enjoyed. Or if the chief design of the Parable be rather to *shew*, that even a *ghost* sent from the other world would not be sufficient to convert those who do not hearken to *Moses* and the *Prophets*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*; still it is necessarily implied in this, that there are *ghosts* in the other world; for if there are not, how could it be supposed, even in a Parable, that any should be sent from thence?

17. If it be said that the Jews had an opinion of this kind current amongst them, and that our Lord did not think it necessary, though it was a false one, to contradict it, but upon this occasion grounded a Parable upon it, with a view to inculcate charity to the poor, and the importance of attending to the word of God. I answer then by so doing our Lord has *confirmed* that false opinion as much as he well could have confirmed it; and on the supposition that the *opinion is false*, the *Parable* is *false* too, and has not one single thing in it that is either true or worthy of notice. And is this consistent with the character of him who *was true and taught the way of God in truth*, and who declares

E himself

himself, *For this cause was I born and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness to the truth?* I would further observe here, that though our Lord very frequently taught by *Parables*, and though the *Parables* delivered by him and recorded by the Evangelists, are very many and of sundry kinds, yet a single instance cannot be produced of one that is not founded in *truth*, and much more, that has not *truth* for the moral of it; that is not calculated and designed to teach us *truth*. The Parable of the *sower* and the *seed*, and the sundry kinds of *ground*, supposes what is true, viz. that there are *sowers* and *seed* and sundry kinds of *ground*. That of the *tares* and *wheat* is founded on *truth*, there are both *tares* and *wheat* in the world. That of the *Father* and his two *sons*, one of whom was a *Prodigal*, is also built on the same basis. There are *fathers* and *sons* among men, some of whom, and often the younger as our Lord supposes, become *Prodigals*. And so of all the rest. There is not one of them that is a mere *fable* founded on a *lie*; and much more, there is not one of them, formed on purpose to *teach* or to *confirm men in a false opinion*, which would certainly be the case with this Parable of the *rich man* and *Lazarus*, on the supposition that the soul *sleeps* or has no *existence* after the death of the body.

17. I must not omit mentioning here, that as this historical anecdote, or Parable, which we have just considered speaks of *Abraham* as being alive in the spiritual world; (as we have already seen *Moses* and *Samuel* were) so our Lord in his conversation with the *Sadducees* respecting the resurrection, Luke xx. 37, 38. proves that he was alive, and *Isaac* and *Jacob* too, by the words of God to *Moses* at the bush, when God calls himself the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. *God is not the God of the dead* (says Jesus) *but of the living; for all*, or (as it may be translated) they

they all live to him. *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, therefore together with all departed this life, whose God *Jehovah* hath declared himself to be, are now alive in the spiritual world, and of consequence all that are dead from *Adam* to this day : They all live unto God or before God, that is, they are alive in that spiritual and invisible world, where God an invisible spirit is known in his *wrath* or his *love* in a manner he is not in this world.

18. If it be objected that our Lord's controversy with the *Sadducees* was not about the separate existence of the soul, but about the resurrection of the dead, and that the passage from *Exodus* is quoted only in proof of that, I answer, it is well known that the *Sadducees* denied a future state altogether : They did not so much as believe that there was either *Angel* or *Spirit*, and therefore our Lord argues with them upon their own principles, and proves the whole of a future state, which many learned men suppose to be comprehended here under the term *anastasis*, translated resurrection. (See Dr. Hammond on *Matth.* xxii.) Indeed the passage seems to prove the present existence and life of the souls of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* much more strongly than it proves the resurrection of their bodies. The argument is this : God is not the God of the dead, but of the living : But God is the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* : Therefore *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* are not dead, but living. But how are they living? As to their bodies? No, certainly : Their bodies have been dead many thousands of years, and were buried in the cave of the field of *Macpelah*, where they are ages ago turned to dust. They are living therefore only as to their souls, and it is chiefly with respect to these that *Jehovah* calls himself their God ; and indeed these are the only self-conscious principles whence men can be denominated, and are the same individual persons.

19. As to the *bodies* of these Patriarchs, the passage may also prove (though not so forcibly) that *they* are not eternally *lost, perished, dead* for ever : God having also, in some sense, called himself the God even of *them*, and therefore being engaged by covenant to do good to *them*. In other words, he calls himself the God of the *whole persons* of these his ancient servants, and therefore will prove himself worthy of that appellation, doing good to their *whole persons* ; which it would be impossible to do, were he to suffer their *bodies* to remain eternally under the power of death and corruption. But still it is manifest the words relate *chiefly* to something then alive, even to the *souls* of those Patriarchs, and they plainly prove *them* to have been strictly and properly *living* when God spake to *Moses* at the bush and when our Lord argued with the *Sadducees*, as they are living also at this day. And that the *Sadducees* denied *this*, and therefore that our Lord's reasoning was *in point* against them, appears not only from the account which sacred and profane history give of their principles, but also and especially from this consideration, that if they had allowed the immortality of the soul, and only denied the resurrection of the body, our Lord's argument might have been easily answered by them. For they might have said, " Though it be true that God is the God only of the *living*, yet this does not prove that the *bodies* of the Patriarchs shall rise again, for they are *living* as to their *souls* ; and with respect to *these*, Jehovah may properly be termed their God, tho' their *bodies* should never be raised." And inasmuch as they made *no* such reply to our Lord's reasoning, it is clear both that they did *not* believe the soul to live after the body was dead, and also, that the *anastasis*, our Lord hereby proved, included a future state in *general*, and especially implied the *immortality of the soul*.

SECTION

SECTION V.

I. **I**T appears from what has been said in the preceding *Sections*, that it is clearly the doctrine of Scripture, *First*, That the *soul* is not a mere *property* of the body, wholly dependant on it, and incapable of existing out of it, but a spiritual substance; which, though united to the body, is of a nature distinct from it, and shall survive it:— And, *Secondly*, That it shall not *sleep* after death, or be in a state of *stupid insensibility*, but in a state of *conscious happiness* or *misery*.

I now proceed to shew that the same Holy Scriptures teach with *equal clearness*, that the souls of the faithful, after death, are *with Jesus*. And what I have to advance on this head will greatly illustrate, and (I hope) confirm and establish the doctrine already proved.

2. With respect to the state of the *wicked* immediately after death, as the subject is very *unpleasant*, and as the inspired penmen dwell less upon it, I shall say little. It is manifest from what has been said already, that their souls exist in a separate state as certainly as those of the righteous, and that they are in *misery*, even as the souls of the righteous are in happiness. St. Luke informs us, Acts i. that Judas *went to his own place*: And in the story or parable of the *rich man* and *Lazarus* mentioned above, we are told that in *Hell* he *lift up his eyes* (speaking figuratively and alluding to our state in the body, where we see only with the *eyes*) *being in torment*. And though the word *adns*, there rendered *Hell*, properly means the *unseen* or *invisible* world; yet we have every reason to believe that in that world the wicked are *with* and *under* the power of the *Devil* and his *Angels*, those Spirits and powers of
E 3
Darkness,

Darkness, whose *servants* and *subjects* they were during their abode on earth ; and like them they are doubtless confined in *chains of darkness*, and reserved unto judgment.

3. But with respect to the *righteous*, the Scriptures speak more largely, as well as more particularly ; not indeed in the *Old Testament*, or with regard to those that departed this life previous to the *incarnation* of Christ, but in the *New Testament*, and with respect to those *holy souls* who depart hence in the true faith of Christ, under the Gospel. I do not mean by this to insinuate that *holy men of old had no hope* after death, or none but what was built on the imperfect discoveries they had of a general resurrection. The attentive reader will have observed that the contrary has been intimated in the beginning of the Essay, and in other parts of it. And it seems to me that the following passages, though perhaps capable of being construed in another sense, yet admit of the easiest interpretation on the supposition of the persons, whose words they are, believing this important doctrine of natural religion, the *immortality of the soul*, and hoping to be admitted to the *vision and enjoyment* of God immediately after death.—Thus Jacob, when just dying, as is recorded Gen. xlix. 18. cried out, *I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord!* Surely it was not any *temporal* salvation for which he declares, when on the brink of death, he had waited, nor could it be the salvation or redemption of his *body* from the grave. For a man not yet dead, and in the grave, could with no propriety be said to wait for deliverance from death and the grave.

4. Still more to the purpose speaks David in sundry parts of the Psalms : As for instance, in Psalm xvii. 15. *As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness : I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness* ; the former clause perhaps referring to the
the

the state immediately after death, and the *latter* to that still greater happiness that will follow upon the resurrection. For, it seems plain, David was fully assured respecting both. In the 16th Psalm, speaking chiefly, as St. Peter has shewn concerning Christ, he manifestly distinguishes the *soul* from the *body*, and as he expressed his confidence that the *latter* should *rest in hope*, viz. in hope of being raised again and even that it should *not see corruption*, till it was raised; so he declares the *former*, the soul should *not be left in Hell*; or (as ~~new~~ is rendered by the *Seventy*, and as we read, Acts ii. 31. *eis adou*, in Hades, that is) the invisible or separate state. Accordingly, Ps. xlix. 15. He says, *God shall redeem my soul from the power of the grave*, that is, he shall preserve it from dying: The grave, which has power over my *body*, shall have none over my soul: *he shall receive me*. Hence his great confidence and hope, as expressed in the 23d Psalm: *Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me, thy rod and thy staff they comfort me: Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.* And still more, in the 36th Psalm—*Oh! how excellent is thy loving-kindness, O God! therefore shall the children of men put their trust under the shadow of thy wings. They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of thy house, and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures. For with thee is the fountain of life; in thy light shall we see light.*

5. But there is a passage in the 73d Psalm, ascribed to Asaph, which is more clear and express than any of these, and still less capable of being forced into any other meaning: *Thou shalt guide me by thy counsel and afterwards receive me to glory*; surely he means immediately, and not five or six thousand years afterwards. For he adds, *My flesh*

flcsh and my heart faileth ; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever. To this I shall only add the well known words of *Isaiah Ch. lviii. 1 & 2 verses.* *The righteous perisheth and no man layeth it to heart and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from that which is evil : He (viz. the righteous man) shall enter into peace : They shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness.* This expression *He shall enter into peace,* seems manifestly to speak of the rest and felicity into which the righteous enter immediately after death, and perhaps also the last clause *Each one walking in his uprightness,* may refer to the same thing.

6. But be it observed, though it seems to me that these passages from the Old Testament were really meant of the happiness of the soul immediately after death ; and in their plain and most obvious sense must be considered in that light ; yet as they are capable, as I said, of being construed into another meaning (though not I think, without putting an unnatural force upon them) I shall not lay any great stress on them : but proceed to observe, that as *Life and Immortality are brought to light by the Gospel,* so under this last and clearest dispensation of divine grace, we have a much surer ground of hope respecting this matter. For the declarations and promises of our Lord and his Apostles give us the fullest assurance of being *with him* to see and enjoy his glory, as soon as dead. And the reader is requested, while he attentively considers the following passages, and weighs the arguments built upon them, to recollect and compare therewith the strange assertions of Dr. Priestley quoted above, and in particular the following, “ If we search the
“ Scripture for passages more particularly expressing
“ five of the state of man at death, we find in them
“ not only no trace of *sense, thought, or enjoyment,*
“ but

"but on the contrary such declarations as expressly
"exclude it."

7. In proof of the point in hand, I shall first produce a passage from the 1st Epistle to the Thes. Ch. v. verse 10, which declares it to have been the *one grand end* of the death of Christ that his followers should be with him, whether before or after death. *Christ Jesus died for us* (says St. Paul) *that whether we sleep or wake we should live together with him.* The word *sleep* here cannot mean *spiritual sleep* or a state of insensibility and indolence, as in the 6th verse of this Chapter, because it cannot be said that those that are in *such a state live together with or to Christ.* Nor can it mean natural sleep as in verse the 7th as (I think) any one that attentively considers the passage will allow. It must therefore mean *death*, which, it is well known, is very often termed *sleep* in the language of this Apostle, particularly several times in the preceding Chapter. This being granted (as it must,) it follows that those who *sleep or die* in the Lord still *live together with him*, viz. in the separate state. And therefore when he comes, he is said (Ch. iv. 14.) to *bring them with him.*

8. And this is quite agreeable to his own prayer put up to his Father for those that should believe in him, as recorded in the 17th of St. John's Gospel. *Father I will* (says he) *that those whom thou hast given me be with me where I am that they may behold the glory thou hast given me, for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.* Now let it be observed here that the end for which our Lord desires that those whom the Father had given him might be with him, is that they *might behold the glory which the Father had given him.* Now the glory which is in a peculiar sense *given him* of the Father is that described by Daniel, Ch. vii. 13, 14. *I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with*

with the clouds of heaven (referring to our Lord's Ascension) *and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him.* This Mediatorial kingdom of our Lord, and the glory of it, is also frequently spoken of in the New Testament, both by our Lord himself, and also by his Apostles; and they agree to assure us that in consequence of it he has *a name above every name, has all power in heaven and earth, is King of kings and Lord of lords, is head over all things to his Church, and has all Judgment committed to him.* But we are also assured, that when he shall have raised the dead and judged mankind at his bar, he will deliver up this Mediatorial kingdom and the glory of it, to the Father, *that God may be all in all.* 1. Cor. xv. 23, 24. It follows therefore that those who believe in him must either see this glory in the intermediate state, between death and Judgment, or they cannot see it *at all*, at least, in any sense that is peculiar to themselves. For as to that wonderful display of his glory which shall be made at the great day, when he shall come *in his own glory and in that of his Father and of the holy Angels*, the sight of *that* shall be no way peculiar to his own people, but shall be vouchsafed to the whole assembled world. It appears therefore (if our Lord was heard in what he prayed) that his followers *are with him where he is*, in a separate state, between death and judgment, and that they there *behold the glory the Father hath given him.*

9. And that this is indeed the case, and that I have given a true interpretation of the above passage from the 17th of St. John, appears beyond a doubt from the promise made by our Lord to the penitent thief upon the cross, of which we have an account, Luke xxiii. 42, 43. *Lord remember me* (said he) *when thou comest in thy kingdom, and Jesus said*

said unto him, verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise. This passage is so obvious in its meaning, that it cannot but be understood by the most illiterate; and it asserts the doctrine I contend for so plainly, that the most learned, who have embraced the contrary sentiment will find it a difficult, not to say impossible task to force any other sense upon it. The *Thief* here seems manifestly to have believed the immortality of the soul and a future state; and therefore that *Jesus*, whom he took to be the true Messiah, would not cease to exist at his death, but would then enter upon his kingdom in the *other world*, as it was plain his kingdom was not of *this world*. Had he not believed these things, he could have had no foundation for saying to a man whom he saw expiring upon a cross, *Lord remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom.* And when our Lord answers his petition by saying, *Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise;* he declares, as expressly as words can declare, that both *his soul* and that of the *Thief*, should that *very day* be together in *Paradise*, that is, in that happy state and place in which holy souls are after death. See 2. Cor. xii. 4, and Rev. ii. 7.

10. And this was quite agreeable to the sentiments entertained by the Jews, as we shall easily be convinced if we consult the learned. Dr. Whitby says, "That it was a familiar phrase with them to say on a just man's dying, *To-day shall he sit in the bosom of Abraham.* And it was their common opinion, that *the souls of the righteous who were very eminent in piety, were carried immediately into Paradise.* The Chaldee Paraphrase on Solomon's Song, iv. 12. takes notice of the *souls of the just who are carried into Paradise by the hands of Angels.* Grotius, in his Notes on this Text, mentions the hearty and sincere wish of the Jews, concerning their friends who are dead, in the language of the Talmudical

Talmudical writers, *Let his soul be gathered to the Garden of Eden*: and in their solemn prayer when one dies, *Let him have his portion in Paradise, and also in the world to come*; by which they mean the state of the resurrection, and plainly distinguish it from this *immediate* entrance into *Eden* or *Paradise* at the hour of death." (Watts on the Separate State.)

Now if this was the meaning of the word *Paradise* among the *Jews*, doubtless, as the Author just quoted observes, "Our Saviour spake the word in *this meaning*, which being known, and common, would easily be understood by the *Thief*, who, in this dying hour, had no time to study hard, or consult the Critics, to see whether some other sense might not be put upon this promise, which would detract from the grace and comfort of it."

But, in truth, as to any *other sense*, the passage will not bear any other, without taking those liberties with it which are wholly unauthorized, and which would entirely spoil the construction of the sentence, and make our Lord express his meaning to this dying criminal in a very awkward or obscure manner.

11. It is true, if this were *one single passage* of *one single* inspired writer, which, however plainly, yet spoke a sense inconsistent with, or not to be paralleled by any *other part* of the Bible; then, in that case, one would be authorized to try if it would not bear some other meaning: but, with regard to this passage, the case is quite the reverse. The *plain, obvious*, and (I may say) *only possible* sense of it, is authorized by many other passages, to be found in almost *every* inspired writer, as manifestly appears from this present Tract, in which I have already produced not a few, and shall yet produce several more. He, who, as we have now seen, promised to the dying Thief, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*, said to his Father, when just expiring,
Father,

Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit; a manner of speaking this, not to be accounted for on the principles of those who believe that the Spirits of men have no separate existence after death, or that they fall into a state of utter insensibility or stupor. Equally unaccountable on *their* principles, is the prayer of dying Stephen, who, *seeing heaven opened, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, cried out, Lord Jesus receive my spirit!*—Had the spirit died with the body, or had it fallen into a state of insensibility, what reason could Stephen have had to address the Lord Jesus in this language? Surely he did not mean, *receive my spirit* after it has ceased to exist, or receive it to *sleep* with thee in heaven. No, he meant (for no other meaning will the words fairly admit of) “receive it to dwell with thee in the glory in which I see thou art.” *This*, Stephen might reasonably expect in consequence of that prayer of our Lord already mentioned, and because of his most express declaration, *I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am you may be also.*

12. And in this expectation, the first Martyr, Stephen, was no way peculiar. We find it to have been the steadfast hope and sure confidence of the primitive Christians in general, and of St. Paul in particular. The passages I refer to in his Epistles are so plain, so express, and so absolutely incapable of being forced into any other sense by the wit or ingenuity of man, that if all the Texts I have already appealed to were conceived to bear another meaning, or could be shewn to give an uncertain verdict, I might very safely leave the decision of the matter with the two following. The one is 2 Cor. v. 1—6. *We know that if our earthly house of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the hea-*

vens. For in this, we groan earnestly, desiring to be clothed upon with our house, which is from heaven: If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this Tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing, that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; (for we walk by faith, not by sight) we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour, that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him.

13. I have quoted this passage at full length, in order that its genuine meaning may more fully appear: and I would observe upon it, *First*, That there is a *conscious being* spoken of in it, which is plainly distinguished from its *house, tabernacle, or clothing*. *Secondly*, That this *conscious being* is supposed to exist when its *house or tabernacle* is dissolved, and its *clothing* put off. *Thirdly*, That previous to the dissolution of this *house or tabernacle*, and the putting off this *clothing*, viz. while this *conscious being* is *at home in the body*, it is not only burdened with divers infirmities, but is *absent from the Lord*, and walks by *faith*, and *not by sight*, *believing*, but not *seeing* the glorious things of the heavenly state. *Fourthly*, That *immediately* upon the dissolution of this *house or tabernacle*, and the putting off this *clothing*, it is both freed from these various burdens, and is *present with the Lord*, walking no longer by *faith*, but by *sight*. *Fifthly*, That the *soul, or conscious being* spoken of, is so confident and sure of all this, that it is *willing*, *ay*, and *desirous*, yea, *earnestly desirous* to be dismissed from this *house or tabernacle*; in other words, to be *absent from the body*, and *present with the Lord*. And, *Sixthly*, That this

this desire does not arise from being weary of the body in which it dwells, and where it is compassed about with infirmity, as if it merely wanted to be *unclothed* of it, or to *put it off*, but rather from what it believes concerning the heavenly glory with which it expects to be clothed when stript of the body; or from the certain prospect it has of happiness when *present with the Lord*, far superior to what it can enjoy while *absent from him* and *present* in the body.

These particulars are all so manifestly contained in this portion of Scripture, and so absolutely irreconcilable with the doctrine I oppose, that it would be an entire waste of time to dwell any longer upon it, with a view to *prove* what is already as plain as any proofs can make it.

14. I shall therefore pass on to the other Text, which is Phil. i. 21—25. *To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. If to live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour; and what I shall choose I know not. For * I am in a strait between two, having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better, but to abide in the flesh is more needful for you. Now here, First, The Apostle speaks of living, living in the flesh, and abiding in the flesh. Secondly, He speaks of*

F 2

dying,

* The original here is very strong and expressive, *συνεχομαι εκ των δυο, την επιθυμιαν εχων εις το αναλυσαι, και συνχρεισω ειναι, πολλω μαλλον χρεισσον.* It is translated by Dr. Doddridge, *I am born two different ways, having a desire to be unbound, and be with Christ, which is better beyond all expression: but to abide in the flesh is more expedient for you.* And he tells us, it seems to be an allusion to a ship stationed at a particular place, and riding at anchor, and at the same time likely to be forced to sea by the violence of the winds; which presents us with a lively representation of the Apostle's attachment to his situation in the Christian Church, and the vehemence of his desire to *be unbound*, as he has rendered *ανελυσαι*; that is, to weigh anchor and set sail for the heavenly Country.

dying, departing, and being with Christ. Thirdly, He compares these two states together, and is in a strait which he should choose. While in the flesh he served Christ and his church, and had fruit of his labours, nay, *to him to live was Christ*; he enjoyed as well as served him: On the other hand, if he died and departed, he should be with him, and know and enjoy him in a manner he could not do here. He concludes, therefore, *Fourthly,* That, as to himself, it would be gain to die, better, yea, far better (*πολλω μλλον κρειττον*) to depart and be with Christ; but as to the Philippians, it would be to their advantage for him to abide longer in the body, and labour among them.

15. Now upon this passage I would put two or three questions to those who hold the Sadducean doctrine:—*First,* On supposition that the soul is *no way* distinct from the body, or *dies with it*, or falls into a state of *stupor* or *insensibility*, with what propriety could the Apostle use such expressions as *abiding in the flesh*, and *departing out of it*? Do not these expressions imply that there is a *conscious principle* distinct from that flesh in which it now *abides*, and out of which, at death, it *departs*? *Secondly,* With what propriety could he *connect* the *departing out of the flesh* immediately with the *being with Christ*, since, according to this doctrine, these two states are not connected at all, but separated by the intervening distance of many *hundreds* or *thousands* of years? *Thirdly,* On the same principles, how could it be *gain* for him to die? What could he gain by becoming *nothing*, or falling into a state of *utter insensibility* for two or three thousand years?—If it be said, he would gain an exemption from all his sufferings, I answer, they must be little acquainted with his *spirit* and *conduct*, who suppose that *these* so moved him, as that he should think it *gain* to be freed from them, though at the expence of all his knowledge

knowledge of Christ, love to him, communion with him, and opportunities of serving him—of all love to his people, and possibility of being any way useful to them; nay, with the loss of all *knowledge, consciousness, and even sense and feeling*; yea, of his very *being*, for a long run of ages!—Is there any thing in his *writings*, or has *Antiquity* handed down any thing concerning him, from whence one might reasonably infer that he was so weary of life, and so perfectly *tired* of his present sufferings, as to be willing and desirous to purchase an exemption from them on these terms? Surely no. Surely the very passage under consideration proves the very reverse.

16. It proves, that notwithstanding he thought it *gain* to die, yet, that the sole reason was, because then he should be *with Christ*: Were it not for *this*, he would not hesitate a moment to choose to abide in the flesh, and labour in the Lord's Vineyard, especially as to him *to live was Christ*. Nay, *as it was*, though he knew he should be *with Christ* the moment he departed, yet considering that his living here was more needful for the Philippians, he both concludes it was God's will he should live a little longer, and shews, that out of love to them, and for the honour of Christ, he perfectly acquiesced in the Divine appointment. *I know (says he) that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith*. Now where does he mention *sufferings* in all this? Where does he fetch an argument from *them* to shew that it would be better to die than to live? Surely *none of these things moved him, neither did he count his life dear to himself, so he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry he had received of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God*.

17. It appears, therefore, that if the Apostle had been of the Sadducean opinion, he would have been in no strait at all, but would have chosen to

live, and be still more *holy, happy, and useful*, ten thousand times, rather than to lose his *self-consciousness*, together with his *life*, till the great day of the resurrection and final judgment. And I will venture to say, so would any one that is at all acquainted with God, and possessed of any love to him, unless, indeed, perfectly worn out with present sufferings and miseries. Nay, according to this doctrine, no person could have *any other motive* for desiring to die, than the *selfish* one of wanting to get rid of his present sufferings, which is perfectly contrary to the view the Scriptures give us of this matter, as well as to the experience of the people of God, especially under the Christian dispensation. And inasmuch as very few are so *extremely* miserable here, as to be willing to lose their very *existence*, and part with all that is near and dear to them to get quit of their misery; this same doctrine would make Death an object of *terror* to almost all flesh, especially to the best part of mankind. It would tend to produce an universal attachment to the present life, and unwillingness to leave it, and that in all states and conditions; with respect to the most *holy* as well as the most *wicked*, those that love God and are *spiritually* minded, as well as those that love him not and are *carnally* minded. And is this the doctrine of the Lord Jesus? Is this the tendency of Christianity? Or this the spirit of its genuine professors?—Surely no, unless *Heathenism* be superior to *Christianity*, and the School of *Socrates* disclose and inculcate principles of greater efficacy, and inspire men with a nobler spirit, than the School of Christ.

18. Seneca tells us, (Epist. 24. 70.) * That when Socrates might have made his escape out of prison, and

* Cum Socrates facile posset educi e custodia, et essent qui promitterent fugam, noluit: remansitque dies triginta in carcere
et

and there were those that engaged to convey him safe away, he refused; and remained thirty days in confinement, waiting for death, that he might remove from mankind the fear of two things the most grievous of all others, *death* and a *prison*. In the last day of his life, when the deadly cup was almost in his hand, he discoursed in such a manner, that, instead of seeming to be dragged to death, he appeared rather to be ascending to Heaven. For thus he thought and spoke, *That souls departing out of the body went two different ways: That those who had defiled themselves with vices, wandered in a certain devious path, shut out from the council of the Gods; but that, on the other hand, those who had kept themselves pure and holy, and who, while dwelling in human bodies, had imitated the life of the Gods, had easy and free access to their assembly.*

“† It was this hope and confidence, (as Henry More observes) whereby he so easily despised his enemies and death itself. And tho’ by the Oracle of Apollo he was pronounced the wisest of men, yet in this alone

et in expectatione mortis, ut duarum rerum gravissimarum hominibus metum demeret, *mortis et carceris*. Supremo vitæ die, cum pene in manu jam mortiferum teneret poculum, locutus ita est, ut non ad mortem trudi, verum in cælum videretur ascendere. Sic enim censebat dicebatque: *Duas esse vias animorum e corpore excellentium. Nam eos qui se vitiis contaminavissent devium quoddam iter ingredi, seclusum a concilio Deorum: contra vero facilem ad Deos aditum patere illis, qui se integros castosque servavissent, essentque in corporibus humanis vitam imitati Deorum. Selectæ e profanis, Lib. iv. c. 17.*

† Erat autem hæc animi spes atque fiducia olim in Socrate, valde memorabilis, qua tam facile adversarios suos mortemque ipsam contempsit. Qui cum *Apollinis* oraculo sapientissimus est judicatus, in hoc tamen solo sapere videri voluit quod, cætera incertus, de Animæ immortalitate nihil dubitarit: neque enim hac de re (ut testatur apud Ciceronem *Lælius*) tum hoc, tum illud, ut in plerisque, sed idem dicebat semper, *Animos hominum esse divinos, iisque cum e corpore exiissent reditum ad cælum patere, optimæque et iustissimæ cuique expeditissimum. Enchir. Eth. Lib. iii. c. 10.*

alone was he willing to be thought wise, in that, being uncertain as to other things, he had no doubt respecting the immortality of the soul. Nor, (as Lælius testifies in Cicero) did he first say one thing and then another, concerning this matter (as is the case with most) but always the same—*That the souls of men are divine, that when they have left the body, they are permitted to return to Heaven, and the best and most just to return the most readily.*"

19. According to Cicero, Cato was animated by the same spirit. In his book *de Senectute*, he represents him as saying, † *I do not repent that I have lived, since I have so lived, as that I have reason to think I was not born in vain. I depart out of life as out of an Inn, and not out of an home. For Nature hath granted us here a lodging to sojourn, and not a place to dwell in. O glorious day, when I shall go to that Divine council and assembly of souls, and shall depart out of this crowd and rabble!*

Of himself Cicero says, || *I am not one that can think the soul perishes together with the man, (the body) or that so much light of understanding, that hath a tincture of the Divine Nature, can possibly be extinguished, but rather that, having spent the time assigned it, it returns to immortality; intimating hereby, as the Author above quoted (Hen. More) observes, "that this life of ours is a kind of death of the soul; a sentiment which Scipio Africanus elegantly expresses to Cornelius, inquiring concerning his departed friends,*

† *Non me vixisse pœnitet, quoniam ita vixi, ut non frustra me natum existimem; et ex vita hac discedo, tanquam ex hospitio, non tanquam ex domo. Commorandi enim Natura diversorium nobis, non habitandi locum, dedit. O præclarum diem cum ad illud divinum Animorum concilium cœtumque profisciscar, et cum ex hac turba et colluvione discedam!*

|| *Non enim is ego sum qui Animum simul cum homine interire putem, tantum que mentis lumen, Divina Natura delibatum, posse extinguì, sed potius, certo tempore emenso, ad immortalitatem redire. De Consol.*

friends, whether they were alive :—* *Yes, indeed (says he) they are alive, who have escaped out of the chains of the body as out of a prison : but your life, as it is called, is truly death.*"

20. Seneca speaks the same language, (vide *Sen. ad Marc. c. 23.*) "*To stay † in the body is never desirable to great men : They rejoice to depart and break forth, and with difficulty endure these narrow lodgings.*" And in another place, (*de beat. c. 15.*) assures us, † "*A wise man will bear death, diseases, and other things which happen in human life, not only patiently, but even cheerfully, that he may obey the law of Nature : As a good Soldier bears wounds, and, when pierced through with darts, and dying, loves the General for whom he falls. He will remember that precept, Follow God.*"

21. Now if even *Heathens*, amidst the darkness of their dispensation, could discover principles which afforded some ground of hope, though after all their hope was little better than conjecture ; if even *they* could speak and act in this manner, and rise above the fear of death, shall the *Christian*, whom *the day-spring from on high hath visited*, and to whom the Gospel of Jesus Christ *hath brought life and immortality to light*, shall he dread it? By no means. What with the Heathen was but *opinion and hope*, is with him *faith and assurance*. He knows that, if the earthly house of his tabernacle were dissolved, he has a building of God, an house not made with

* *Imo vero, ii vivunt qui ex corporum vinculis tanquam e carcere evolaverunt : Vestra vero quæ dicitur vita, mors est. De Somnio Scipionis.*

† *Nunquam magnis viris cara in corpore mora est : exire atque erumpere gestiunt, ægre has angustias ferunt. Scl. Et. Hist. Lib. iv. c. 17.*

‡ *Vir sapiens mortem, morbos, et alia, quæ in vitam humanam incurrunt, feret, non solum patienter, sed etiam libenter, ut pareat legi naturæ ; quem ad modum bonus miles fert vulnera, et transverberatus telis, moriens amat eum, pro quo cadit, imperatorem. Habebit in animo illud præceptum : Deum sequens. Scl. Et. Hist. ibid.*

with hands, eternal in the heavens. He is assured that he is *immortal*, 2 Tim. i. 10. and, properly speaking, *shall never die*, John v. 24. vi. 47. 50. xi. 26. That his death is but a *depar-ure*, an *exodos*, or going out of the body, as St. Peter calls it, 2 Epist. i. 15. a removing out of his present *tabernacle*, a being *un-clothed*: that it shall not *separate him from the love of God in Christ Jesus*, Rom. viii. 38, 39: that as soon as he is *absent from the body* he shall be *present with the Lord*, shall be *with Christ*, which is far better than to stay here. Hence, as the Apostle declares, he believes that not only *life*, but that even *death is his*, which, by the by, could not possibly be the case, if, at death, he lost his self-conscious existence, or dropt into a state of stupor or insensibility: he believes, I say, that *death is his*—that is, will be for his good, his *real and inconceivable advantage*, and, therefore, so far is he from *fearing it and dreading the awful moment*, that knowing in *whom he has believed*, and being persuaded *he will keep what he commits unto him*, even his immortal spirit, *safe unto that day*, he even triumphs over that last enemy, saying, *Whether I live, I live unto the Lord, or whether I die, I die unto the Lord: living or dying, therefore, I am the Lord's! Oh! death, where is thy sting! To me to die is gain!*

Oh! when will death, now stingless like a friend,
Admit me of yon Choir! O when will death,
This mould'ring, old partition wall broken down,
Give Beings, one in Nature, one abode?
O death divine, that gives us to the skies!
That re-admits us, thro' the guardian hands
Of elder breth'ren, to our Father's Throne!

22. And now having proved, to a demonstration, I think, to those that acknowledge the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, (the three points I undertook) I shall put a period to this Tract when I have drawn one practical inference from what has been advanced.

Is it a fact, then, that we have in us a principle distinct from the body, called the *inner man*, the *soul*

*Soul, or the spirit, which is often spoken of in Scripture, as the man, the person (I keep under my body : No man hateth his own flesh,) and which, as St. John says, 3d Epist. may prosper, even when the body does not prosper, and as St. Paul expresses it, may be renewed day by day, even when the outward man perisheth, and which cannot be killed even when the body is killed, but will survive it and live in a separate state ; then let us not live as if we were mere flesh, devoid of any such principle. Let us not so attend to the body, and provide for its ease and accommodation, as to neglect the soul, and disregard its welfare. Let us remember the saying of the Heathen, a saying worthy of a Christian, Major sum et ad majora genitus, quam ut mancipium sim mei corporis : quod equidem non aliter aspicio quam vinculum et pondus et pœnam.—I am greater, and born to greater things, than that I should be the slave of my body !—Let us consider the body, as the same author says in another place, ** “ (Since in our present state nothing can be done without it), as some thing *necessary* rather than *great* ; and reflect that the pleasures it is a means of administering are both vain and short lived, nay and if not used with great temperance and moderation, such as must be repented of.”

“ A wise man indeed (adds he *) takes care of the body as of a necessary burden, but does not love it, nor become the *servant* of that which he ought to *command*. No man is free who serves the body, for too much care about it subjects us to many masters.” While therefore we take care to furnish the body with all it wants, with food, with clothing,

* Corpus quia nihil fieri sine illo potest, magis necessariam rem crede, quam magnum. Vanas suggerit voluptates, breves, ac, nisi magna moderatione temperentur, pœnitendas. *Senec. Epist. 23. In Se. Et.*

* Sapiens corporis; velut oneris necessarii, non amator, sed procurator est: nec se illi, cui imperare debet, subjicit. Nemo liber est qui corpori servit. Nam multos dominos nimia pro corpore sollicitudo, nobis imponit. *Sen. Epist. 92.*

clothing, with an habitation, and with every thing needful; nay, with more than what is needful, with what is convenient, and even delightful; let us see also that the wants of the better part be supplied, the wants of the rational and immortal soul. Let us take care that it do not perish, do not become miserable after death, for lack of knowledge, or for lack of grace. Let us examine in what state it is, and not rest till we find reason to conclude that it is in a good state.

23. Let us remember it is involved in the guilt of innumerable past sins, and let it be our first care to get that cancelled in consequence of repentance towards God, and through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us remember, also, that its whole nature is corrupted, and all its faculties woefully enfeebled; and let us apply to God, the great Father of Spirits, for that renewing grace which only can restore to us the strength and purity we have lost. Let us earnestly seek, and unweariedly pursue, that image of God, that divine nature, which covered and adorned the souls of our first parents as they came out of the hands of their great Maker, but which was lost by the fall, lest, when uncl. th'd of the body, we be found naked of the garment of salvation and robe of righteousness, and so be unfit for the heavenly Society, for which we are designed. Let us prepare for the world of spirits. Let us dress and beautify the rational and immortal part, over which death hath no power, with the gifts and graces of the Spirit of God, with knowledge, holiness, and happiness, that it may be fit for the business and enjoyments of that most blessed and glorious state. In this way we shall discern more clearly, and relish more sweetly the evidences of this great truth above recited, that though the body is dead because of sin, yet the spirit is life because of righteousness, and though at death the dust return to the earth as it was, yet shall the spirit return to God who gave it.

